Morgan Callaway, Jr.

Studies in the Syntax of the Lindisfarne Gospels

11.27.18.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division PE 231

Section C 15

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 27 1918
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Hesperia

SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES:
STUDIES IN ENGLISH PHILOLOGY
Edited by JAMES W. BRIGHT
Number 5

STUDIES IN THE SYNTAX OF THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

With Appendices on Some Idioms in the Germanic Languages

BY

MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR.
Professor of English in The University of Texas

BALTIMORE
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
1918

PREFACE

The present instalment [1] of my projected *Studies in the Syntax of the "Lindisfarne Gospels"* is restricted to an investigation of the Participle and of the Infinitive. The main object of this instalment is to determine whether the syntax of these verbals in the Northumbrian dialect differs essentially from that in the West-Saxon dialect as set forth in the writer's monographs [2] on the Participle and the Infinitive in the latter dialect. The investigation is based upon a statistical reading of the four Lindisfarne Gospels and of their Latin originals, as given in W. W. Skeat's *The Holy Gospels: Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions,* Cambridge, 1871-1887. In the study of each verbal, I have attempted to make my statistics complete, and have habitually given an account of the Latin correspondents of the Northumbrian gloss, and in the more doubtful constructions have cited the parallel passage in the Rushworth version of the Gospels, which latter has been read entire, although no account is taken thereof except in the way here indicated. Occasional omissions and misclassifications are inevitable, but I hope that they will not prove so numerous or so serious as to invalidate the trustworthiness of this investigation.

As the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is merely an interlinear gloss, and in many respects a faulty one, a larger question at once presents itself, whether or not such a gloss can give any trustworthy evidence as to the normal syntax of the dialect in which it is written. That very gross errors are made, is evidenced by such passages as the following, in which the author uses a nominative as the direct object of a verb and a dative as the subject of a finite verb:—*John* 18. 28: *gelæddon* forðon *se hælend* from

[1] The next instalment will be devoted to the Subjunctive Mood.

[2] *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* Baltimore, 1889; *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* Baltimore, 1901; and *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* Washington, D. C., 1913.

caifa = *Adducunt* ergo *iesum* a caiapha (similarly in the Rushworth version); *Luke* 16. 5: miððy *weron geceigedo* forðon syndrigum *scyldgum* hlaferdes his cuoæð = *conuocatis* igitur singulis *debitoribus* domini sui dicebat (leaf lost in the Rushworth version). But even these errors are not in reality so gross as they at first appear. The probability is that, in the former example, the glossator is merely naming the word, not the form thereof, to be used; and that, in the second, he turns the ablative absolute of the participle in the native English way, by a finite verb, but, on reaching the ablative subject, has forgotten about his rendering of the participle, and, naturally therefore, translates the ablative of the Latin noun by a dative. At any rate, such errors are exceptional; and the proper answer to our question seems to be this. As to the normal order of words, this Northumbrian gloss, like most interlinear translations, gives next to no evidence of value, since, as a rule, the glossator adheres strictly to the order of his Latin original. As to the normal idioms to be used in the combining of words into sentences, however, it gives invaluable evidence, especially in those locutions in which the Northumbrian gloss consistently diverges from the idiom of the Latin original. In a word, if in the syntax of any part of speech, as of the participle or of the infinitive, the glossator consistently shuns a Latin idiom, and consistently substitutes therefor another idiom, we are justified in holding that the substitute idiom represents his native usage,—a principle that seems to me to hold perfectly in the syntax of the verbals.

While, as stated above, the main purpose of the present investigation is to discover what light this Northumbrian material may throw upon the syntax of the West-Saxon dialect, it is hoped that the studies may prove of interest from an absolute standpoint, the more so that they disclose several idioms not known in West-Saxon. Among the more noteworthy of these idioms may be mentioned the Absolute Participle with an Accusative Subject, possibly also with a Nominative Subject; the Infinitive as the Object of a Preposition; the Imperative

Use of the Infinitive; and that substitute for the Infinitive which I have ventured to denominate the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction. Moreover, certain constructions that are only slightly represented in West-Saxon, are somewhat frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as the Inflected Infinitive with an Accusative Subject in Objective Clauses and the Uninflected Infinitive with Accusative Subject in Subjective Clauses.

So far as I have been able to learn it, I have given the history of opinion on all points discussed by me. Numerous works dealing with the phonology or the inflections of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* have been published, and are duly recorded in my Bibliography. Of these I need here mention only those that have been of most service to me: Professor Albert S. Cook's *A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels (Lindisfarne Gospels, or Durham Book)*, Halle, 1894; Dr. H. C. A. Carpenter's *Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienuebersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift,* Bonn, 1910; Dr. Theodor Kolbe's *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien,* Bonn, 1912; and the several works by Professor Uno Lindelöf listed in my Bibliography. So far as I know, my monograph is the second treatise devoted specifically to the syntax of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the first being Mr. C. E. Bale's *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in the Lindisfarne Gospels,* a University of Iowa Master's dissertation of 1907. But, in the nature of the case, some syntactical observations occur in the three works mentioned above, in the other treatises dealing with the inflections of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* and in the various editions of that text by Bouterwek, by Stevenson and Waring, and by Skeat, all recorded in my Bibliography. Wherever help has been found, it has been gratefully accepted and specifically acknowledged.

Perhaps a word should be added as to the date of the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* And here I cannot do better than quote the most recent deliverance in reference thereto by the editor of our text, the late Professor Walter W. Skeat. In his *English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day* (Cam-

bridge, 1911), p. 22, Professor Skeat expressed himself as follows: "The Northumbrian glosses on the four Gospels are contained in two MSS., both of remarkable interest and value. The former of these, sometimes known as the Lindisfarne MS., and sometimes as the Durham Book, is now MS. Cotton, Nero D 4 in the British Museum, and is one of the chief treasures in our national collection. It contains a beautifully executed Latin text of the four Gospels, written in the isle of Lindisfarne, by Eadfrith (bishop of Lindisfarne in 698-721), probably before 700. The interlinear Northumbrian gloss is two and a half centuries later, and was made by Aldred, a priest, about 950, at a time when the MS. was kept at Chester-le-Street, near Durham, whither it had been removed for greater safety. Somewhat later it was again removed to Durham, where it remained for several centuries."

Since, as already incidentally stated, I have cited the *Rushworth Gospels* in rare and difficult constructions, I quote, also, Professor Skeat's account of the Rushworth version of the Gospels, as given on p. 22 of his *English Dialects*: "The second MS. is called the Rushworth MS., as it was presented to the Bodleian Library (Oxford) by John Rushworth, who was deputy-clerk to the House of Commons during the Long Parliament. The Latin text was written, probably in the eighth century, by a scribe named Macregol. The gloss, written in the latter half of the tenth century, is in two hands, those of Farman and Owun, whose names are given. Farman was a priest of Harewood, on the river Wharfe, in the West Riding of Yorkshire. He glossed the whole of St. Matthew's Gospel, and a very small portion of St. Mark. It is worthy of especial notice, that his gloss, throughout St. Matthew, is not in the Northumbrian dialect, but in a form of Mercian. But it is clear that when he had completed this first Gospel, he borrowed the Lindisfarne MS. as a guide to help him, and kept it before him when he began to gloss St. Mark. He at once began to copy the glosses in the older MS., with slight occasional variations in the grammar; but he soon tired of his task, and turned it over to

Owun, who continued it to the end. The result is that the Northumbrian glosses in this MS., throughout the three last Gospels, are of no great value, as they tell us little more than can be better learnt from the Durham book; on the other hand, Farman's Mercian gloss to St. Matthew is of high value, but need not be considered at present. Hence it is best in this case to rely, for our knowledge of Old Northumbrian, on the Durham book *alone*." The italics in the last sentence of this quotation are Professor Skeat's. As to the question raised in this sentence concerning the relative value of the Lindisfarne and the Rushworth versions of the Gospels, the present writer prefers to reserve judgment until the appearance of further instalments of his studies in the syntax of the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

As in my former syntactical studies, I have taken account of the verbals in the kindred Germanic languages. This fact will justify, I trust, the several Appendices strewn throughout the present monograph. In these appendices I have striven to bring up to date the chapter on the Absolute Participle in the Germanic Languages, published in 1889; that on the Appositive Participle in the Germanic Languages, published in 1901; and that on the Infinitive in the Germanic Languages, published in 1913. And I have devoted one Appendix (IX) exclusively to a consideration of some " Germanic Analogues to the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction." It is a pleasure to find that these later investigations strongly tend to confirm the theories formerly set forth by me as to the syntax of the verbals not only in Anglo-Saxon but also in the other Germanic Languages. With slight modifications here and there for individual languages, the theories derived from a minute study of the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian dialects seem to apply equally well to the other Germanic languages. Though fairly confident of the correctness of the view just expressed, I realize that my interpretation of the idioms of the participle and of the infinitive in the Germanic languages other than English rests upon statistics which, though carefully gathered by others, are for several of the languages incomplete, and in

some instances take little account of the original Greek or Latin. I should be glad, therefore, if Germanic grammarians would test the theories in question by making as detailed a study of the syntax of the verbals in the other Germanic languages as I have attempted to give thereof in the West-Saxon and the Northumbrian dialects.

Although my Bibliography lays no claim to exhaustiveness, I have striven to make it as nearly complete as was possible considering my remoteness from the larger libraries and the difficulties of communicating with Europe incident to the International War. Even partial success in this direction would have been impossible but for the kindness shown me by the librarians of several of our older universities. For such courtesies I wish to tender my cordial thanks to the librarians of the following universities: Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. And to the librarian of the University of Texas, Mr. John E. Goodwin, I am indebted for many kindnesses. In the Bibliography I have given the titles not only of the chief accessible works on the Northumbrian Dialect of the Old English Period, but also of a few of the more noteworthy treatises on the other dialects of that epoch and on the Northern Dialect of the Middle English Period and of the Modern English Period. And, as I am throughout comparing the Old Northumbrian syntax with that of West-Saxon and of the Germanic languages, I have added, in the Bibliography, the titles of the more noteworthy treatises dealing with the syntax of the participle and of the infinitive in English and in the other Germanic languages, in the later as well as in the earlier periods, that have appeared since the publication of my monographs on these verbals. A few dissertations that had appeared before the publication of those monographs, but that had escaped me or had been inaccessible, have likewise been added. In a word, as this study is supplemental to my former studies, so this Bibliography is supplemental to my former bibliographies. And only in the case of a few of the more important works have I repeated here titles given in my former monographs.

Despite the fact that this study of the verbals in Northumbrian is largely based upon the writer's former studies of the verbals in West-Saxon, I have tried to make the present monograph easily intelligible to the reader who may not have access to the earlier monographs. If I should not always have succeeded in this, I hope the reader will generously grant me indulgence for the endeavor's sake. And the further fact that the present study is a comparative one, will excuse, I trust, the frequent references in this monograph to my former studies.

To the Editor-in-Chief of the Supplementary Series of *Hesperia,* Professor James W. Bright, I am indebted for his offering occasional suggestions for the improvement of my monograph, for his lending me rare books from his private library, and, most of all, for his volunteering to devote a number of *Hesperia* to this work. Professor J. L. Boysen, of the School of Germanic Languages of the University of Texas, has kindly read the proofs of the sections dealing with the Germanic languages other than English, and has been of especial help in the subsections dealing with the Scandinavian Languages. My colleague and life-long friend, Professor Killis Campbell, has added another to his many former kindnesses to me. He has read the whole of the proof, has offered valuable criticisms upon the same, and has at all times given the undertaking his cordial sympathy. Where help is so cheerfully given as by these friends, indebtedness becomes, not a burden, but a perennial source of pleasure.

Morgan Callaway, Jr.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Texas, March 31, 1918.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE

Introduction: Definition, Case 1
A. The Absolute Dative-Instrumental 2
General Statement 2
I. The Present Participle 3
Statistics 3
Notes 5
II. The Preterite Participle 7
Statistics 7
Notes 10
Origin of the Idiom 13
Appendix I. The Absolute Dative in the Other Germanic Languages 13
B. The Absolute Accusative 25
General Statement 25
I. The Present Participle 31
Statistics 31
Notes 33
II. The Preterite Participle: Statistics 33
Origin of the Idiom 34
Appendix II. The Absolute Accusative in the Other Germanic Languages 34
C. The Absolute Nominative 35
General Statement 35
I. The Present Participle: Statistics 36
II. The Preterite Participle: Statistics 37
Origin of the Idiom 38
Appendix III. The Absolute Nominative in the Other Germanic Languages 38
D. Synoptic Table of the Absolute Participle 39
E. The Uses of the Absolute Participle 39
General Statement 39
Synoptic Table 42
F. Origin of the Idioms with the Absolute Participle: Summary Statement 43

CHAPTER II

THE APPOSITIVE PARTICIPLE

Introduction: Definition, Regimen 45
A. The Present Participle 46

PAGE

I. With an Object 46
General Statement 46
Statistics 46
1. Of the Nominative 46
2. Of the Genitive 49
3. Of the Dative-Instrumental 50
4. Of the Accusative 50
Origin of the Idiom 51
Appendix IV. The Governing Power of the Appositive Present Participle in the Other Germanic Languages 52
II. Without an Object 61
General Statement 61
Statistics 61
1. Of the Nominative 62
Notes 64
2. Of the Genitive 67
3. Of the Dative-Instrumental 68
4. Of the Accusative 69
Origin of the Idiom 70
B. The Preterite Participle 71
I. With an Object 71
General Statement 71
Statistics 71
Origin of the Idiom 72
II. Without an Object 72
General Statement 72
Statistics 72
1. Of the Nominative 72
2. Of the Genitive 74
3. Of the Dative-Instrumental 75
4. Of the Accusative 75
Origin of the Idiom 78
C. Synoptic Table of the Appositive Participle 78
D. Uses of the Appositive Participle 78
General Statement 78
I. The Adjectival Use 81
II. The Adverbial Use 82
III. The Co-ordinate Use 85
Notes 86
Synoptic Table 87
E. Origin of the Idioms with the Appositive Participle: Summary Statement 89

CHAPTER III

THE INFINITIVE

Introduction 90
Forms of the Infinitive 90

PAGE

Functions of the Infinitive ... 91
Differentiation of Uninflected Infinitive and of Inflected Infinitive a Main Problem ... 91
The Origin of the Various Idioms with the Infinitive Another Main Problem ... 91
The Order of Words not Treated ... 92
The Voice of the Infinitive ... 92
I. The Subjective Infinitive ... 93
A. The Active Infinitive ... 93
1. With Active Finitive Verb ... 93
General Statement ... 93
Uninflected Only ... 95
Inflected Only ... 95
Uninflected and Inflected Each ... 96
Statistics ... 96
2. With Passive Verbs ... 97
General Statement ... 97
Statistics ... 98
3. Differentiation of the Two Infinitives ... 98
4. Origin of the Idiom ... 99
Appendix V. The Subjective Infinitive in the Other Germanic Languages ... 100
B. The Passive Infinitive ... 101
C. Notes ... 102
II. The Objective Infinitive ... 102
A. The Active Infinitive ... 102
1. With Active Finite Verb ... 102
General Statement ... 102
Uninflected Only ... 104
Inflected Only ... 105
Uninflected and Inflected Each ... 105
Statistics ... 107
2. With Passive Verbs ... 109
General Statement ... 109
Statistics ... 110
3. Differentiation of the Two Infinitives ... 110
4. Origin of the Idiom ... 111
B. The Passive Infinitive ... 113
C. Notes ... 113
III. Other Substantival Uses of the Infinitive ... 115
A. The Active Infinitive ... 115
As a Predicate Nominative ... 116
As an Appositive ... 116
As the Object of a Preposition ... 117
IV. The Predicative Infinitive with Auxiliary Verbs ... 118
A. The Active Infinitive ... 118
General Statement ... 118

PAGE

Uninflected 118
Inflected 118
Differentiation of the Two Infinitives..... 119
Origin of the Idiom..... 119
B. The Passive Infinitive..... 119
C. Notes 119
V. The Predicative Infinitive with Verbs of Motion and of Rest Other Than *Wutun*..... 121
The Active Infinitive..... 121
General Statement..... 121
Uninflected Only..... 121
With Verbs of Motion..... 121
With Verbs of Rest..... 122
VI. The Predicative Infinitive with *Wutun*..... 122
A. The Active Infinitive..... 122
Origin of the Idiom..... 123
B. The Passive Infinitive..... 123
C. Notes 123
VII. The Predicative Infinitive with *Bia(n)* (*Wosa*)..... 123
The Active Infinitive..... 123
A. Denoting Necessity or Obligation..... 123
B. Denoting Futurity..... 124
C. Denoting Purpose..... 125
Origin of the Idiom..... 125
Notes 126
VIII. The Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject..... 126
General Statement..... 126
As Object..... 127
A. The Active Infinitive..... 127
I. Uninflected 127
General Statement..... 127
With Verbs of Commanding..... 128
With Verbs of Causing and Permitting 128
With Verbs of Sense Perception..... 128
With Verbs of Mental Perception..... 129
With Verbs of Declaring..... 129
With Other Verbs..... 129
Statistics 130
Origin of the Idiom..... 131
II. Inflected 134
General Statement..... 134
Statistics 134
Origin of the Idiom..... 136
Differentiation of the Two Infinitives: see Origin of the Idiom..... 136
B. The Passive Infinitive..... 137
As Subject..... 137

PAGE

A. The Active Infinitive 137
I. Uninflected 137
General Statement 137
Statistics 138
Origin of the Idiom 140
II. Inflected 141
Statistics 141
Origin of the Idiom 141
Differentiation of the Two Infinitives: see Origin of the Idiom 141
B. The Passive Infinitive 141
C. Notes 141
Appendix VI. The Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject in the Other Germanic Languages 142
IX. The Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject 143
The Active Infinitive 143
Appendix VII. The Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject in the Other Germanic Languages 145
X. The Final Infinitive 155
A. The Active Infinitive 155
1. With Active Finite Verb 155
General Statement 155
Uninflected Only 156
Uninflected and Inflected Each 157
Inflected Only 157
Statistics 158
2. With Passive Verbs 161
3. Differentiation of the Two Infinitives 161
4. Origin of the Idiom 161
B. The Passive Infinitive 162
C. Notes 162
XI. The Infinitive with Adjectives 165
A. The Active Infinitive 165
General Statement 165
1. Uninflected 166
Statistics 166
2. Inflected 166
Statistics 166
3. Differentiation of the Two Infinitives 167
4. Origin of the Idiom 168
B. The Passive Infinitive 168
C. Notes 168
XII. Other Adverbial Uses of the Infinitive 169
The Causal Infinitive 169
The Consecutive Infinitive 169
The Instrumental Infinitive 169
Origin of the Idiom 169
Appendix VIII. The Consecutive Infinitive in Gothic 170

PAGE

XIII. The Infinitive with Nouns 171
A. The Active Infinitive 171
General Statement 171
Uninflected 171
Statistics 171
Inflected 172
Statistics 172
Differentiation of the Two Infinitives 173
Origin of the Idiom 173
B. The Passive Infinitive 174
C. Notes 174
XIV. The Imperative Infinitive 175
The Active Infinitive 175
Uninflected 175
Statistics 175
Origin of the Idiom 176
XV. Some Substitutes for the Infinitive 176
I. The Predicate Nominative of the Present Participle for the Predicative Infinitive after Verbs of Motion .. 176
II. The Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle for the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject 177
Origin of the Idiom 179
III. The Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction 180
A. Made Up of an Accusative Plus a Present Participle 180
B. Made Up of an Accusative Plus a Preterite Participle 182
C. Origin of the Idiom 183
Notes 184
Appendix IX. Germanic Analogues to the North-umbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction 186
XVI. Notes 196
XVII. Synoptic Tables of the Uses of the Infinitive and of the Substitutes Therefor 197

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

I. Concerning the Participle 199
A. The Absolute Participle 199
B. The Appositive Participle 201
II. Concerning the Infinitive 203
A. The Active Infinitive 203
B. The Passive Infinitive 213
C. Substitutes for the Infinitive 214

BIBLIOGRAPHY 216
ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA 240

STUDIES IN THE SYNTAX OF THE LINDISFARNE GOSPELS

CHAPTER I

THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE

Introduction

In this chapter, a participle is considered Absolute when its use conforms to the definition of the Absolute Clause given in *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 1: "When to a substantive not the subject of a verb and dependent upon no other word in the sentence (noun, adjective, verb, or preposition) a participle is joined as its predicate, a clause is formed that modifies the verbal predicate of the sentence and denotes an accompanying circumstance, as in *Urbe expugnata, imperator rediit.*" From its apparent, but not real, grammatical independence, this has been denominated an absolute clause.

The case of the absolute participle varies in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* As in West-Saxon, so in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* normally the absolute participle is in the dative-instrumental case. But in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* we find, too, the accusative and, apparently, the nominative used absolutely,—both idioms that are unknown in West-Saxon, as I have tried to show in my aforementioned monograph. For each of the cases used absolutely the participle is at times uninflected; and for each case divergent participial forms are used occasionally; hence at times, in absolute uses, the case of the clause has been determined by the form rather of the substantival subject than of the participial predicate. At times, too, the form of substantive or of participle (occasionally of both) is indefinite; and we have what may be termed "crude"[1] forms of substantive

[1] On the term "crude" here, see *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 2.

or of participle (or of both); that is, a weathered form that cannot with certainty be assigned to any definite case, but that usually represents an unweathered dative-instrumental (occasionally an unweathered accusative or nominative). That some of my assignments of case will not meet with acceptance, I do not doubt. Critics will be the more lenient, I believe, when they recall the fact that the monographs specifically dealing with the inflections of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as those by Dr. H. C. A. Carpenter and by Professor A. S. Cook, cited in my Bibliography, have left many individual examples, even when specifically cited, unclassified as to case and gender. That the possible differences as to case-assignment will not be so numerous as to invalidate the trustworthiness of my respective groups, is my hope and belief.

A. The Absolute Dative-Instrumental

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* proper, exclusive of the "Introductions" thereto, the Absolute Participle in the Dative-Instrumental is not quite so frequent as in the *West-Saxon Gospels*, there being 52 examples in the former to 66 in the latter. But, if we include the "Introductions," the number [2] of examples of the Absolute Dative-Instrumental is appreciably larger in the former (94) than in the latter (66).

The following are typical examples of the Absolute Dative-Instrumental:—*Mk.* 14. 22: *ettendum him* onfeng se hælend hlaf = *manducantibus illis* accepit iesus panem; *Mk.* 16.20^{b,c}:[3]

[2] The detailed statistics are as follows:

	Lindisfarne:		West-Saxon:	
	Pres. Ptc.	Past Ptc.	Pres. Ptc.	Past Ptc.
In the Gospels.....	33	19	25	41
In the Introductions.....	29	13	00	00
Totals	62	32	25	41
Grand Totals.....	94		66	

[3] Throughout this study, superior letters distinguish different examples in the same verse. As a rule, I have expanded contractions. I have not differentiated þ and ð, but have uniformly used ð. For the symbol ł I

bodadon eghuær *drihtne miðwyrcende* & ðæt word *trymende* mið fylgendum becenum *uel* tacenum = Praedicauerunt ubique *domino cooperante* et sermonem *confirmante* sequentibus signis; *Mk.* 1.18: hreconlice miððy forleorton *uel forletnum nettum* fylgendo weron him = protinus *relictis retibus* secuti sunt eum.

The complete Statistics of the Dative-Instrumental Absolute are as follows:—

I. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE

(62, including all in the Notes except Note 3)

Dative-Instrumental, Singular or Plural
(54 + 8 in the Notes)

The Dative-Instrumental of the Absolute Present Participle ends normally in *-nde* in the singular (masculine and neuter) and in *-ndum* in the plural (masculine and neuter): see Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 532, 537, and 542. In the singular (masculine) the participle ends once in *-nd* (*L.* 14.32) and once in *-ndum* (*L.* 21.5); in the plural (masculine), once in *-ndu* for *-ndum* (*L.* 9.43). Normally the vowel preceding the endings named above, is *e*, but occasionally it is *a* or *u:* see Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 529. When no ending is given below, *-ndum* is to be understood.

astiga, *descend* (1): *L.* (1): 9.37.
bidda, *ask, request* (1): *L.* (1): I.[4] 5.10.
cliop(p)iga, *cry out, exclaim* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 21.4.

have written out the Latin equivalent, *uel*, and for the symbol ⁊ I have used &. Occasionally, for the sake of clearness, I have altered the punctuation of the original text; and I have habitually ignored the hyphenation of compounds in the Latin original and in the Northumbrian gloss.

[4] I. here and elsewhere in the statistics, when used in connection with the name of a gospel, indicates that the example occurs in the "Introduction" to that gospel. The examples in the "Introductions" are cited by page and line; those in the Gospels, by chapter and verse. The segregation of the examples occurring in the "Introductions," here and throughout this monograph, from the examples occurring in the Gospels proper, facilitates a comparison of the respective idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and in the *West-Saxon Gospels*, in which latter no Introductions occur.

cwoeða, *say, declare* (2) : *L.* (1) : I. 10.2^{b}.—*J.* (1) : I. 6.13.

doa, *do, make* (2) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 19.1 (with the dative, a proper name, to be supplied from the Latin ablative).—*L.* (1) : 14.32 (*-nd;* Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 532 : dsm.).

efneiorna, *run together* (1) : *L.* (1) : 11.29^{a}.

efnespreca, *talk, converse* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 11.12.

eftcerra, *return* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 8.3^{b}.

eta (eatta), *eat* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 14.22.

færa, *go* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 20.29.

fraigna (fregna), *enquire* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 6.19^{b} (*-nde*).

fromgeonga, *depart* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 11.7.

gefeaga, *rejoice* (2) : *L.* (2) : I. 3.14 (*-nde*) ; I. 8.5^{b} (*-nde*).

gefraigna (-fregna), *enquire* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 20.3 (*-nde*: *gefraigende*).

gehera, *hear* (1) : *L.* (1) : 19.11.

gelefa, *believe* (3) : *J.* (3) : I. 5.6; I. 5.14; I. 6.9^{b}.

geonga, *go* (2) : *L.* (2) : 9.34^{b}, 57.

habba, *have* (1) : *L.* (1) : 7.42.

hlioniga (hliniga), *recline* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 5.13 (*-nde*).

hrowa (rowa), *row* (1) : *L.* (1) : 8.23 (*hrowundum*: see Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 542, anmk.).

innfara (-færa), *enter into* (1) : *L.* (1) : 22.10^{a}.

iorna, *run* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 8.3^{a}.

miðwyrca, *cooperate* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 16.20^{b} (*-nde*).

ofstiga, *descend* (2) : *Mat.* (1) : 17.9.—*Mk.* (1) : 9.9.

ondswæriga, *answer, respond* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 5.15.

onginna, *begin* (1) : *L.* (1) : 21.28^{a}.

onsacca (onsæcca), *deny* (1) : *L.* (1) : 8.45.

singa, *sing* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 8.10 (?).

slepa, *sleep* (2) : *Mat.* (1) : 28.13^{b}.—*Mk.* (1) : I. 3.5^{b} (*-nde*).

smeaga, *think, reflect* (1) : *L.* (1) : 3.15.

soeca, *seek* (5) : *L.* (2) : I. 6.19^{a} (*-nde*) ; I. 10.9 (with the dative, a proper name, to be supplied from the Latin).—*J.* (3) : I. 5.3^{a} ; I. 6.1 ; I. 6.14^{a}.

stiga, *ascend, descend* (2) : *L.* (2) : I. 4.1^{a} ; 2.42.

trymma, *confirm* (1): *Mk.* (1): 16.20[c] (*-nde*).
undoa, *unloose* (1): *L.* (1): 19.33 (or Appositive?).
ungelefa, *disbelieve* (1): *L.* (1): 24.41[a].
wundriga, *wonder* (3): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.12.—*L.* (2): 9.43 (*-ndu:* Cook: dp.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 542: dpm.); 24.41[b].
ymbsceawiga, *look around* (1): *L.* (1): 6.10.
ymbsitta, *sit around* (1): *L.* (1): 22.55.
ymbstonda, *stand around* (1): *L.* (1): 12.1[a].

NOTES

1. *An Old English Absolute Dative-Instrumental Active Translates a Latin Ablative Absolute Passive* in the following:—*Mat.* I. 16.3[b]: tungolcræftiga stearra him hlatuu gesægde *gebreingendum uel geafendum* mið *ðingum* togebedon = christum magi stella sibi duce nuntiante *oblatis munęribus* adorauerunt;[5] *Mat.* I. 20.20[c]: ðær moder sunana sebedæis biddende *sæccendum sedlum* cueð = matri filiorum zebedaei petenti *negatis sedibus* ait:—*L.* 6.20: he *ahebbendum* (*sic*) *egum* on ðegnum his cuoeð = ipse *eleuatis oculis* in discipulos suos dicebat (leaf lost in the Rushworth version); *L.* 15.13: miððy *gesomnandum allum* . . . færende wæs = *congregatis omnibus* . . . profectus est (leaf lost in the Rushworth version). The *West-Saxon Gospels* has an active Appositive Participle (*beseonde*) in *L.* 6.20 and an active finite verb (*gegaderude*) in *L.* 15.13.—See the Note on the Voice of the Appositive Participle at the end of Chapter II, and of the Predicative Participle at the end of Chapter III.

2. *The Dative-Instrumental Subject Is to Be Supplied* in the following, in one of which the Latin has an appositive, not an absolute, participle:—*Mk.* 15.29[a]: & ða *bifœrendum* geebolsadon *uel* ebolsande hine cærrende heafda hiora & cuoeðende = Et *praetereuntes* blasphemabant eum mouentes capita sua et dicentes (Rushworth: *ib.;* W. S.: sfv.);—*L.* 24.47: suæ were

[5] If *mið* is considered a preposition here, we have an appositive, not an absolute, phrase; but I consider *mið* an adverb here. See Note 3 below and Note 1 under "The Preterite Participle."

rehtlic ðætte crist geðrowade & eftarisa from deadum ðirdda dæge & ðætte were abodenn in noma his hreonise & eftforgefnise ðara synna in allum cynnum *onginnendum* from hierusalem = sic oportebat christum pati et resurgere a mortuis die tertio et praedicari in nomine eius paenitentiam et remissionem peccatorum in omnes gentes *incipientibus* ab hierosolyma;—*J.* I. 6.1: ða ældo mið unsibsumnise gedroefedo uoeron *soecendum* he from ðæm inlichtet cyðig geworðad uæs = *pharisaeis* anxietate turbatis atque *quaerentibus* ipse ab inluminato cognitus adoratur (Cook: *ældo,* ap.; *soecendum,* dp., but *ældo* must be np., I think).

3. *A Prepositional Phrase Plus a Present Participle in the Dative-Instrumental Translates a Latin Ablative Absolute Passive* in *Mat.* I. 3.1[a]: we gehehtun ðæt *of ðæm* ana ða ðoht gesegon gecerde *uel* givixla *gemendum* ða æfterra gewuna we ondetað = imperauimus ut *his* tantum quae sensum uidebantur mutare *correctis* reliqua manere pateremur. Strictly according to our definition, of course, we have not an absolute clause here; nor does the clause seem to be appositive. Since it is such a botch, I have not counted the clause under either head. See Note 1 above and Note 1 below, p. 10. I consider the Northumbrian participle Attributive in such passages as the following, in which, again, a Lindisfarne present participle in the dative corresponds to a Latin passive participle in the ablative:—*J.* 11.41: uutudlice *mið hebbendum* upp *egum* cuoeð = autem *eleuatis* sursum *oculis* dixit; *ib.* 17.1: *mið underhebendum egum* in heofnum cuoeð = *subleuatis oculis* in caelum dixit. In this use of the present participle in the dative after *mið,* as in the similar use of the preterite participle in the dative after *mið,* discussed in Note 1 below, we doubtless have an illustration of the Germanic striving for a method of translating the Latin ablative absolute that would not do violence to the English (Northumbrian) idiom. See the discussion of the West-Saxon *be him lifigendum* in *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 42-44, and of the

Scandinavian participial dative phrase introduced by a preposition (usually *at* but occasionally *með*), below, in Appendix I.

4. *An Old English Dative-Instrumental Absolute Is Made Up of a Noun and an Adjective in the Dative* in *Mat.* I. 18.6ª: in eorðo ðara lioda *halgum monnum* diobles fara ðerhgelefde *uel* sende in bergum = In terra genassenorum *sanatis hominibus* dæmones ire permittit in porcos. For the same idiom in West-Saxon, see *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 44.

5. *A Dative-Instrumental Participle with an Uninflected Pronoun Translates a Latin Ablative Absolute* in *L.* 21.5: ðara *sum cuoeðendum* of temple . . . cuoeð = *quibusdam dicentibus* de templo . . . dixit.

II. THE PRETERITE PARTICIPLE

(33, including the examples in the Notes)

The Dative-Instrumental of the Absolute Preterite Participle ends, in the singular, oftenest in *-ed* (masculine, feminine, and neuter), less frequently in *-(e)ne* (masculine and neuter), and occasionally in *-eno* (masculine, feminine, and neuter), in *-de* (neuter), in *-edo* (*-ado*) (feminine), in *-t* (neuter), in *-en* (masculine), in *-na* (feminine), and in *-ni* (masculine); in the plural, normally in *-um* (masculine, feminine, and neuter: of strong verbs in *-num* and of weak verbs in *-dum*), occasionally in *-(e)no* (masculine and neuter) and in *-de* (feminine). Concerning these endings, see Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 549, 552, 553, and 556. As indicated below, some of the examples are extremely doubtful. When no ending is given below, *-um* is to be understood.

acuoeða, *say* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.30: *efne acwoedni* uteodon on mor = *hymno dicto* exierunt in montem. [Cook: *efne,* dsm.; *acwoedni,* dsm.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 549: dat.-inst. sg., masc.]

ahebba, *lift up* (1): *L.* (1): 24.50.

bega, *bend* (1): *Mk.* (1): 10.17: sum oðer *cneuo beged* fore hine bædd hine = quidam *genu flexo* ante eum rogabat eum.

[Professor Cook makes *cneuo* dsn., but does not assign any case to *beged.*]

bityna, *close* (1): *J.* (1): 20.26.

efnegeceiga, *call together* (2): *Mk.* (1): 8.1.—*L.* (1): 23.13.

forblawa, *blow* (1): *J.* (1): 6.18: ðe sæ uutudlice *winde* miclum *forblauene* ofstod *uel* aras = mare autem *uento* magno *flante* exsurgebat.

forcu(m)ma, *become dry or hard* (1): *L.* (1): 21.26.

fordrifa, *drive out, eject* (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.11: ðæm dumbe tunga *fodrifen uel* gescyfen *diubol* — (blank) = muto linguam *eiecto dæmone* reddit. [*Diubol* may be nominative here, as is claimed by Professor Cook; if so, *fordrifen* is predicate nominative or absolute nominative instead of uninflected dative-instrumental.] *Mk.* (1): 5.40.

foresetta, *propose* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 19.12^{b}: striones bisen *uel* meregrotta bigetna *efennise foresetna* gelic ðon bisin of segna fiscum hine gehriordum ofgesæde = Thesauri *uel* margaritæ repertae *comparatione proposita* similiter parabolam de saginae piscibus se prandis (= separandis) exponit. [Cook: *efennise,* " ns. ? " *foresetna,* " apn. ? " But I do not see why the noun may not be considered dative-instrumental singular. The participle is perhaps apn., *proposita* being mistaken for the nominative plural neuter instead of the ablative singular feminine. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 551, makes the participle apn., also.]

forleta, *leave, dismiss* (4): *Mat.* (1): 13.36.—*Mk.* (1): 1.18.—*L.* (2): 5.11: underlæded woeron to eorðo scioppo *forletno allum* gefyligde weron hine = subductis ad terram nauibus *relictis omnibus* secuti sunt illum. [Professor Cook makes *forletno* " npn. ? " here, but dpm. in the next passage that I quote. To me, the two passages hang together. Dr. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 550, considers *forletno* in *L.* 5.11 as napn. He does not cite *L.* 5.28.] *L.* 5.28: forleorte *uel* miððy *allum forletno* aras fylgende wæs him = *relictis omnibus* surgens secutus est eum.

(ge)bega, *bend* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.29^{a}: *cnew gebeged* bifora him bismeredon = *genu flexu* ante eum inludebant. [Cook:

cnew, ds.; *gebeged* not classified. See Carpenter, *l. c.,* p. 253, who seems to consider that the participle is used absolutely here although he assigns no particular case thereto.]

(ge)binda, *bind* (1): *Mat.* (1): 22.13.

(ge)bringa, *bring* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.10: sende twoelfe boderes miđ bodum læređ *gebroht gefea* hælo *uel* halra = Mittens duodecim pradicaturos praeceptis instruit *conlata gratia* sanitatum. [Cook: *gefea,* nsn. here though cited as ds. for other passages; *gebroht,* pp.; but see Carpenter, *l. c.,* p. 253, who seems to consider that the participle is used absolutely here although he assigns no particular case thereto.]

(ge)cuoeđa, *say, speak* (1): *J.* (1): I. 1.13: *gecuedne criste* = *dicente christo.*

(ge)drysn(i)a, *extinguish, end* (1): *L.* (1): I. 3.4ª: bið sald đætte gode on god full & sune selenis *gedrysned uel* geendad *gebed* apostolum gewordne miđ hlod drihtnes gecorenes tal = datur ut deo in deum pleno et filio proditionis *extincto* (sic) *oratione* apostolis facta sorte domini electionis numerus. [Cook: *gedrysned,* pp.; *gebed,* dsn.; Carpenter: not cited.]

(ge)hera, *hear* (1): *Mat.* (1): 15.12: wast forđon ældormenn *geherde word uel* gehered wæs word geondspyrnede weron *uel* aron? = scis quia pharisaei *audito uerbo* scandalizati sunt? [*Geherde* may be indicative preterite; it is not cited by Cook for this passage. Carpenter does not cite *geherde* as a participle.]

gesparriga, *close, shut* (1): *Mat.* (1): 6.6: & *gesparrado dure* đin gebidd faeder đinne = et *clauso ostio* tuo ora patrem tuum. [Cook: *gesparrado,* " dsn.? " *dure,* dsf.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 553, anm. 3: " In *gesparrado* dure đin, *Mt.* 6.6 (= *clauso ostio tuo*) sind kasus und genus schwer zu bestimmen."]

(ge)đreatiga, *rebuke* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 2.16.

(ge)wælta, *bend* (1): *Mat.* (1): 17.14: geneolecde to him monn *cneum gewælteno* before hine cueđ = accessit ad eum homo *genibus prouolutis* ante eum. [Cook: *cneum,* dpn.; *gewælteno,* pp. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 556, anm. 2, makes *gewælteno* here napn.]

ofgemearciga, *designate* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.14: *ofgemærcade*

æc oðrum tuæm & unseofontigum *ðeadum* sileð bodo = *Designatis* et aliis *lxx* duobus dat praecepta. [*Ofgemærcade* may be indicative preterite, 3rd sg., as Professor Cook holds. Carpenter does not cite *ofgemærcade* as a participle.]

onsetta, *place upon* (1): *Mk.* (1): 8.23. [Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 556, anmk. 2, calls attention to the fact that in *onsetnum* we have an analogical strong dative plural instead of the expected weak form.]

underlæda, *put down* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 3.12: miððy ðonne ða regulas ðu redes ða underbeged *uel* underðiodid arun ðæs sceomaes *uel* telnisses *dwala underlaeded* = cum itaque canones legeris qui subiecti sunt confussionis (*sic*) *errore sublato.* [Cook: *dwala,* dsm.; *underlaeded,* pp. Carpenter does not cite *underlæded* as a participle.]

unforleta, *not to leave* (1): *Mk.* (1): 12.20: dead wæs *unforletne sed* = mortuus est non *relicto semen.* [Rushw.: *ib.;* W. S.: na *læfedum sæde.*—Cook: *unforletne,* adj. ptc. in dsn., but *sed,* asn.—Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 549: *unforletne,* disn.—Clearly the erroneous form of the Lindisfarne noun (*sed*) is due to the erroneous form of the Latin original (*semen*).]

untuna (untyna), *open* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 4.4b: miðð ðy wutedlice *untuned boc* swæ oðre bisen ðæt *uel* ðæt forecwide gewite ðu welle = Cum igitur *aperto codice* uerbi gratia illud siue illud capitulum scire uolueris. [*Boc* may be nominative, as is held by Professor Cook; if so, *untuned* is predicate nominative or absolute nominative. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 455, however, gives *boc* as one form of the dative, but not for this passage. He does not cite *untuned* as a participle.]

worða, *become, be made* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.18.

NOTES

1. *A Prepositional Phrase Plus a Preterite Participle in the Dative-Instrumental Translates a Latin Ablative Absolute* in *Mat.* I. 17.12: micles beames *to uel miðð efennisse gewordeno* læraðð = trabis *comparatione facta* docet. [Cook: *efenisse,* dsf.; *gewordeno,* " nsf. (nfn.?); " Carpenter, *l. c..,* § 549: " In Mt.

Pr. 17.12 *to uel mið efennisse gewordeno* (*comparatione facta*) ist der Kasus schwer festzustellen." Personally I am inclined to consider *to* or *wið* as an organic part of the noun and to write *toefennisse* (or *wiðefennisse*); in which case we should have a true dative-instrumental absolute. Similarly, in the following passage, I should read *miðceping* as one word and consider that we have an absolute dative-instrumental: *L.* I. 5.2: hia lycedon . . . of fæstern *forbodeno* ðæm brydgum æc woedes & wines niwes *mið ceping* becuoeð = murmurantes . . . de ieiunio *athibita* sponsi et uestimenti ac uini noui *comparatione* redarguit. [Cook: *forbodeno,* ns.; *ceping,* dsfn.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 549, anmk. 1: "In L. Pr. 5.2, *f'orbodeno* (= *athibita*) liegt vielleicht nsf. oder npn. vor. Cook hält die letzten 3 für nsf."] In both of these examples, *mið* and *to* seem to me to be suggested by *com* in *comparatione.* I count these two examples. On the other hand, I consider that the Northumbrian participle is used Attributively in passages like the following, in which, also, the phrase is introduced by a preposition (*mið*):—*Mk.* I. 4.15^{c}: haedno forebeadend gelicad *uel* gebis hersumnise *mið bisene œdeawed* = gentiles prohibens imitandos humilitatis *exemplo monstrato; ib.* 14.26: *mið sua cuoednum wordum* ðona foerdon on mor = *hymno dicto* exierunt in montem; *ib.* I. 3.1^{a}: ðegnas to bodanne mið word *mið gebrohtum mœhtum* sendeð = discipulos ad praedicandum uerbo *conlatis uirtutibus* mittet (possibly *mið* and *gebrohtum* should be written as one word, in which case the participle would be used Absolutely); *ib.* 6.5: untrymigo *mið onsetnum hondum* gegemde *uel* gehælde = infirmos *inpositis manibus* curauit;—*L.* I. 7.5^{a}: ðone dumba diulas *mið ðy geboette* gemeð *ðæt sprec* = Mutum daemonia cum *restituto* curat *eloquio* (possibly we should read *miððy* as one word and consider it a conjunction?); *ib.* I. 6.2: *mið gebroehtum mœhtum* sendeð tuoelfum = *Conlatis uirtutibus* mittit duodecim (see note on *Mk.* I. 3.1^{a} above); *ib.* I. 4.8: ðrittig wintra *mið ðio gefuulwad drihtne* ðrinise on fulwiht asægdnise tosceaded is = triginta annorum *baptizato domino* trinitatis in

baptismo mysterium declaratur; *ib.* 22.41: *mið gesetnum cneoum* gebæd = *positis genibus* orabat; *ib.* I. 9.6[a]: eðnise & *geseteno mið bisene* from esne herende uel foedende læreð = facultatem *positaque similitudine* de seruo arante uel pascente docet; *ib.* 10.30[a]: *mið wundum onsettenum* fromfoerdon half cwic *uel* lifigiende forleten = *plagis impositis* abierunt semiuiuo relicto;—*J.* 19.30: *mið gebegdum heafde* gesalde ðæt gast = *inclinato capite* tradidit spiritum. On the borderline between the Attributive and the Appositive use, but leaning more to the latter, is the participle in the following:—*L.* I. 4.13: *eftasægd* soðlice *uel* æc ðio widua of serapta *uel* ðæs licðroueres neman syri *mið clænsunge* ðætte ðerh middum hiora . . . oferfoerde asægd is = *relata* etiam uidua de serapta uel leprosi neman siri *mundatione* quod per medium eorum qui eum de monte præcipitare uolebant transierit indicatur; *ib.* I. 3.4[b]: biþ sald ðætte gode on god full & sune selenis gedrysned *uel* geendad gebed apostolum *gewordne mið hlod* drihtnes gecorenes tal = datur ut deo in deum pleno et filio proditionis extincto oratione apostolis *facta sorte* domini electionis numerus etc. [Cook: *gewordne,* dsn.; *hlod,* dsn; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 540: *gewordne,* dative-instrumental, sn.] In *L.* I. 9.14[a], the phrase is introduced by the preposition *of,* and again the participle is more probably Appositive than Attributive: *of gebed* ðæs ælaruas on temple & bærsynnig *foregesettet* læreð ne to worpanne ða merdo ah to ondetende (*sic*) synno = *Oratione* pharisaei in templo et publicani *proposita* docet non iactanda merita sed confitenda peccata. —See Note 3 above, under " The Present Participle."

2. *An Old English Dative-Instrumental Absolute Is Made Up of a Noun and an Adjective in the Dative,* possibly, in *L.* I. 8.14: laðum ða nedlicum mið ðon & sauel his & *ondfenge rode* gefylgendo woero ðæt gelic getimbrendes torres & of gefeht cyninga tuoege gesceadeð = Odituris necessitudines insuper et animam suam et *assumta cruce* secuturi similitudinem aedificandæ turris et de bello regum duorum exponit (Cook: *ondfenge,* not cited for this passage; *rode,* dsf.).

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

That the Dative-Instrumental Absolute here in the Northumbrian, as in the West-Saxon, is due to Latin influence is evident. (1) The dative-instrumental translates a Latin ablative absolute in all cases except two (*Mk.* 15.29[a] and *L.* I. 5.13, in each of which the Latin has an appositive participle). (2) In the majority of instances (157 out of a total of 249 or in the ratio of 1.58 to 1, for the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as a whole), the Latin absolute construction is rendered otherwise than by an absolute participle in the Northumbrian, usually [6] by a co-ordinated finite verb (about 74 times) or by a subordinated finite verb (about 70 times), or in the ratio of 1.057 to 1, whereas in the *West-Saxon Gospels* the subordinated finite verb is somewhat more common than the co-ordinated, the proportion being 1.19 to 1. Despite this divergence, both glossator and translator are true to the native English idiom of finite verb instead of participle. (3) The idiom in West Saxon and probably in the Germanic languages as a whole was borrowed from the Latin. See *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 31 ff.

APPENDIX I

THE ABSOLUTE DATIVE IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Since the publication of my monograph on *The Absolute Participle in Anglo Saxon* in 1889, in which (pp. 31-36) I gave a brief discussion of the Absolute Participle in the Germanic languages other than Anglo-Saxon, there have appeared a number of works dealing, usually incidentally, with the Absolute Construction in the Germanic languages exclusive of English. The more important of these treatises I mention in the following sections as I take up each group of languages.

[6] In the remaining 13 examples, the Latin absolute participle is rendered by a prepositional phrase, 6 times; by an appositive participle, 3 times; by a noun in an oblique case, twice; by an infinitive, once; and once it is omitted.

To begin with the Gothic, the noteworthy treatises dealing with the Absolute Dative that have been published since 1889 are as follows: Professor Heinrich Winkler's *Germanische Casussyntax,* I, Berlin, 1896, pp. 118-140; Professor Berthold Delbrück's *Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen,* Vol. IV, Part 2, Strassburg, 1897, pp. 495-496; Professors Oskar Erdmann and Otto Mensing's [7] *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax,* Vol. II, Stuttgart, 1898, § 312; Dr. M. J. van der Meer's *Gotische Casussyntaxis,* Leiden, 1901, § 95; Dr. Ant. Beer's [8] *Kleine Beiträge zur Gotischen Syntax: I. Der Absolute Dativ* (a reprint from the *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* for 1904), Prag, 1904; Dr. H. Stolzenburg's "Die Uebersetzungstechnik des Wulfila Untersucht auf Grund der Bibelfragmente des Codex Argenteus," in the *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie,* XXXVII, 1905, pp. 178-179; Professor Wilhelm Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch,* Dritte und Vierte Verbesserte Aufl., Heidelberg, 1910, § 260; Professor Joseph Wright's *Grammar of the Gothic Language,* Oxford, 1910, § 436; and Dr. J. M. N. Kapteijn's "Die Uebersetzungstechnik der Gotischen Bibel in den Paulinischen Briefen," in *Indogermanische Forschungen,* XXIX, 1911, p. 330.

As before 1889, so in these later discussions, two views as to the dative absolute construction in Gothic are advocated. The one school holds that the construction was independently developed in the Germanic languages, and that the Greek influence was secondary only. Substantially [9] this view is held by Messrs. Winkler, Streitberg, van der Meer, and Beer,[10] and has

[7] Though usually listed under both names, as here, the second volume is exclusively by Dr. Mensing.

[8] In this article Dr. Beer announced that he was shortly to publish another article on the Absolute Participle in Gothic; if it has appeared, it has escaped me.

[9] Slight differences are purposely ignored here.

[10] Perhaps I should add here the name of Professor Hans Naumann, who, in his *Kurze Historische Syntax der Deutschen Sprache,* Strassburg, 1915, p. 14, holds that probably the Dative Absolute was independently devel-

been succinctly stated by Professor Streitberg, *l. c.*, § 260: "*Der Dativus absolutus.* Wir können die Entwicklung der dativischen Partizipialkonstruktion, die man als die absolute bezeichnet, noch deutlich verfolgen. Den Ausgangspunkt bilden Sätze wie *qimandin þan in garda duatiddjedun imma þai blindans* = ἐλθόντι εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοί M. 9, 28.—Hier hängt der pronominale Dativ regelrecht vom Verb ab und ist von einem partizipialen Attribut begleitet. Sind Partizipium und Pronomen weit voneinander getrennt, so kann zur Erhöhung der Deutlichkeit das Pronomen nochmals zum Partizip hinzugefügt werden, vgl. *innatgaggandin imma in Kafarnaum duatiddja imma hundafaþs* = εἰσελθόντι αὐτῷ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος M. 8,5. Diese bequeme Konstruktion wendet nun der Übersetzer mit Vorliebe an, um den griech. Genitiv absol. wiederzugeben. Meist, doch nicht immer ist eine Beziehung des übergeordneten Verbs zum Subjekt des Gen. abs. vorhanden; sie fehlt ganz L. 3, 1 R 9, 1 k 5, 3. Die Grundlage dieser Dativkonstruktion mag germanisch sein, da auch das Nordische sie kennt, vgl. Grimm, Gramm. 4, 1090 Neudruck; ihre got. Ausgestaltung steht jedoch sichtlich unter griech. Einfluss. Vgl. Lücke S. 19 ff., Winkler 118 ff., v. d. Meer, 216 ff., A. Beer Kl. Beiträge zur got. Syntax (Böhm. Ges. d. W., phil. Kl., 1904, Nr. XIII)."—It is true that, as Professor Streitberg states, the dative absolute is found in Old Norse; but, as we shall see in our next section, it is now generally considered an importation into Old Norse from the Latin.

The other school, on the contrary, holds that foreign influence (in the Gothic the Greek and in the other Germanic languages the Latin) was paramount, and that the native influence of whatever sort was secondary only; in a word, that the Germanic languages borrowed the dative absolute from the classical lan-

oped in Gothic, but that it was borrowed from the Latin in Old High German. As the grounds of Professor Naumann's belief in the native origin of this construction in Gothic are substantially identical with those of Professor Streitberg, I content myself with quoting the fuller statement of the latter, as given above.

guages (Greek or Latin). Substantially this view is held by Messrs. Delbrück, Stolzenburg, and Wright;[11] and it is happily stated by Professor Delbrück, *l. c.*, pp. 495 f.: "Der absolute Dativ im Gotischen ist in etwas über zwanzig Fällen bezeugt, z. B. *nauhþan imma rodjandin gaggiþ sums manne* = ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχεταί τις Luk. 8, 49., *þaruh nauhþan duatgaggandin imma gabrak ina sa unhulþa* = ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν δαιμόνιον Luk. 9, 42; *andanahtja þan vaurþanamma . . . berun du imma* = ὀψίας δέ γενομένης ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτόν Mark 1, 32. Es fragt sich, ob wir hierin eine ursprünglich germanische Wendung oder Nachahmung des Griechischen zu erkennen haben. Für die letztere Annahme spricht, wie O. Lücke in seiner lesenwerthen Abhandlung 'Absolute Partizipia im Gotischen und ihr Verhältnis zum griechischen Original' (Magdeburg, 1876) ausführt, zunächst der Umstand, dass Ulfilas nirgends einen absoluten Dativ braucht, ausser wo seine Vorlage ihn aufforderte (1. Kor. 11, 4 und Luk. 9. 34 bot der lateinische Text den Anlass), sodann die Thatsache, dass der Schriftsteller der Anwendung dieser Konstruktion sichtlich aus dem Wege geht, und endlich der Zustand in den verwandten Dialekten. Der Heliand nämlich kennt die absolute Partizipia garnicht, im Angelsächsischen ist der absolute Dativ wie Morgan Callaway (the absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon, Baltimore, 1899) gezeigt hat, nur da vorhanden, wo lateinische Vorbilder den Abl. abs. darboten, im Altnordischen und Althochdeutschen gilt er ebenfalls als Eindringling. Diese Gründe sprechen entschieden

[11] I am not certain as to the position of Professor Wright; he merely says, *l. c.*, § 436: "The Dative of the participles is often used absolutely like the ablative in Latin, and the gen. in Greek." Nor am I sure as to the view of Dr. Mensing, who, § 312, seems to halt between the two schools; or of Dr. Kapteijn, who does not express an opinion as to the origin of the absolute construction in Gothic, but who attributes in general more originality to Ulfilas than does Dr. Stolzenburg, and who would probably fall in group 1;—a natural result of considering, as Dr. Kapteijn (p. 260) tells us he does, only the passages in which Ulfilas varies from his Greek original. Dr. R. Lenk, in "Die Syntax der Skeireins," p. 292, holds that the dative absolute in Gothic is partly of native and partly of Greek origin

für die Fremdheit der Konstruktion. Ich möchte aber annehmen, dass diejenigen, welche sich ihrer bedienten, doch an Wendungen anknüpfen konnten, welche ihr Sprachgefühl ihnen darbot. Und zwar war das zunächst möglich bei dem persönlichen Dativ. Wenn es Mark 5, 35, heisst *nauhþanuh imma rodjandin quemun* = ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται, so sehe ich nicht ein, warum *rodjandin* nicht ebensogut Dativ der betheiligten Person sein soll, wie etwa der Dativ in dem griechischen Satze μυρομένοισι δὲ τοῖσι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς ψ 109 (vgl. 1, 299). An solche Vorbilder kann man sich bei dem Versuch, die abs. Genitive widerzugeben, soweit sie Personen bezeichnen, recht wohl angelehnt haben. Anders dürfte es sich mit den zahlreichen Zeitangaben verhalten. Es könnten darin Lokative von Zeitbegriffen vorliegen (vgl. 1, 225) zu denen ein Partizipium hinzugefügt ist.—Eine andere Art, den griech. Gen. abs. wiederzugeben, ist *at* mit dem Partiz., z. B. *jah sunsaiv nauhþanuh at imma rodjandin qam Judas* = καὶ εὐθέως, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, παραγίνεται Mark 14, 43; *atiddjedun du þamma hlaiva at urrinnandin sunnin* = ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου Mark 16, 2. Dieselbe Ausdrucksweise liegt nach Grimm 4, 906 vereinzelt in der Edda vor. Offenbar ist es unrichtig zu sagen, die Präposition sei der absoluten Partizipialkonstruktion vorgetreten. Vielmehr hat man in der Wendung mit *at* einen zweiten Versuch zur Wiedergabe der absoluten Konstruktion zu erblicken, und also wortgetreu (aber freilich nicht sinngetreu) zu übersetzen: ‘bei ihm, als er noch redete,’ d. h. so viel als: ‘während er noch redete.’ ”

As in 1889, I believe that Dr. O. Lücke was right in claiming that the Absolute Dative in Gothic was borrowed from the Greek; but I now think, also, that the secondary native influence, as stated by Professor Delbrück, was unduly minimized both by Dr. Lücke and by me. And it has long seemed to me that, as declared by Professor Delbrück, the advocates of the native origin of this construction in Gothic allowed too little weight to the fact that in the Germanic languages as a whole the absolute construction is relatively rare, and that in one (Old Saxon) it is unknown.

On the Dative Absolute in Old Norse, also, several treatises that have appeared since 1889 make noteworthy contributions. The more important are Professors H. Falk and A. Torp's *Dansk-Norskens Syntax i Historisk Fremstilling,* Kristiania, 1900, pp. 221-223, and Professor M. Nygaard's two works: "Den Lærde Stil i den Norrøne Prosa" in the *Sproglig-Historiske Studier Tilegnede Prof. C. R. Unger,* 1896 (= Nygaard[2]), pp. 157-158, and his *Norrøn Syntax,* Kristiania, 1906 (= Nygaard[3]), § 229. Two important works dealing with the absolute dative in Old Norse that appeared before 1889, but that were then unknown to me are G. F. V. Lund's *Oldnordisk Ordföjningslære,* København, 1862, and Professor M. Nygaard's "Om Brugen af det Saakaldte Praesens Particip i Oldnorsk," in *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* for 1879 (= Nygaard[1]), pp. 203-228. Lund's statement, *l. c.,* § 54, does not make it clear to me whether he considered the absolute dative in Old Norse to be due to foreign influence or not: "Dobbelt hensynsform bruges for at betegne samme forhold som den latinske ablativus consequentiæ (Madv. lat. sp. § 277) og den græske dobbelt ejeform, sædvanlig med tilföjelse af *at* (hvilket dog næppe er den oprindelige udtryksmåde), dog også uden dette." Professor Nygaard, however, comes out squarely for the Latin influence on the origin of the dative absolute construction without a preposition, though he correctly observes that the native influence is shown in the phrase made up of a preposition [12] (usually *at*) plus the dative of a noun and of a participle. His statement concerning the latter locution is as follows (Nygaard,[1] p. 207): "Særskilt mærkes, at part. stundom føies appositivt til et nomen, der styres af praep. *at* (især forat udtrykke tid) saaledes, at part. med nominet smelter sammen til et begreb, og udtrykket bliver at oversætte enten ved til nominet i eieform at føie et verbalsubstantiv eller ved en tidssætning, hvori subjektet gjengiver nominet og prædikatet participiet. Dette udtryk, der oprin-

[12] Concerning the analogous West-Saxon idiom of *be him lifigendum* etc., see *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 42-44.

delig vistnok er i overensstemmelse med sprogets egne analogier, bliver i latiniserende sprogbrug et bekvemt middel til at gjengive den latinske absolute ablativ." He then cites as examples of this idiom:—*Kgs.* 174.33: *at hanum lifanda* ("i hans levetid," "medens han lever"); *Harb.* 58: *at uppverandi solu* ("medens sol er oppe"). Concerning the first idiom, the real dative absolute and, therefore, without a preposition, Professor Nygaard[1] writes (p. 207): "Stærkest viser sig den latinske paavirkning, naar udtrykket gaar over til en absolut dativ uden præp." Of this idiom he gives this illustration:—*Eids.* 22: þoat hjun segi skilit millim sin, þa ma hvarki þeira ser til forræði leita *baðum þeim lifandum.* Professor Nygaard's earliest statement concerning this idiom, just quoted, was reaffirmed in 1895, in his "Den Lærde Stil i den Norrøne Prosa," p. 158, and in 1906, in his *Norrøn Syntax,* § 229, Anm. 2, which latter I quote: "Til et nomen, der er styret af en præp. (især *at*), kan præs. part. føies i app. for at udtrykke et samtidigt forhold eller en ledsagende omstændighed. I F. S.[13] forekommer endel udtryk af denne art som tidsbetegnelse. . . . I L. S.[14] ogsaa for at betegne andre forholde. . . . Ved paavirkning af latinsk absolut ablativ bruges i L. S. paa samme maade ogsaa dativ uden præp." To the same purport is the statement of Professors Falk and Torp, *l. c.,* p. 221. After stating that the dative absolute in Gothic is borrowed from the classical languages (Greek), they add concerning Old Norse: "I samme retning gaar oldnorskens vidnesbyrd, idet her den absolute dativ uden præposition udelukkende tilhører den oversatte litteratur (som de fra oldfransk oversatte 'Strengleikar') og senere retsdokumenter; ogsaa her har da vistnok fremmede forbilleder været bestemmende."

If I have dwelt long on the absolute dative in the Scandinavian languages, it is partly because I gave so little about the construction in these languages in 1889, and partly because, as already stated incidentally in my discussion of the absolute con-

[13] F. S. = Folkelig Stil, 'popular style.'
[14] L. S. = Lærd Stil, 'learned style.'

struction in Gothic, so distinguished a scholar as Professor Streitberg as recently as 1910 declared that the occurrence of the absolute dative in Old Norse was one ground for believing that the absolute construction is a native Germanic idiom. With all due respect to Professor Streitberg, it seems to me that, on the contrary, all that we know about the absolute construction in Old Norse tends to show that the dative absolute was not a native Germanic idiom, but was a foreign importation.

This conviction will be strengthened, I believe, by a brief consideration of the chief treatises dealing with the Dative Absolute in High German that have been published since 1889. The more noteworthy of these treatises are V. E. Mourek's *Weitere Beiträge zur Syntax des Althochdeutschen Tatian,* Prag, 1894, pp. 35-37; Professor Heinrich Winkler's *Germanische Casussyntax,* I, Berlin, 1896, pp. 118-140 (chiefly on this idiom in Gothic); Professor Berthold Delbrück's *Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen,* Vol. IV, Part 2, Strassburg, 1897, pp. 495-497; Professors Oskar Erdmann and O. Mensing's *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax,* Vol. II, Stuttgart, 1898, pp. 274-275; Dr. C. W. Eastman's *Die Syntax des Dativs bei Notker,* a Leipzig dissertation of 1898, pp. 41-43; Dr. J. B. Crenshaw's *The Present Participle in Old High German and Middle High German,* a Johns Hopkins dissertation which, though dated 1893, was not published until 1901, pp. 8-13; Professor H. Wunderlich's *Der Deutsche Satzbau,* 2nd ed., Vol. I, Stuttgart, 1901, pp. 392-393; Dr. W. Manthey's *Syntaktische Beobachtungen an Notkers Uebersetzung des Martianus Capella,* a Berlin dissertation of 1903, p. 34; Dr. W. Göcking's *Das Partizipium bei Notker,* a Strassburg i. E. dissertation of 1905, pp. 27-33; Dr. K. Meyer's *Zur Syntax des Participium Praesentis im Althochdeutschen,* a Marburg dissertation of 1906, pp. 61-65; Professor W. Wilmanns's *Deutsche Grammatik,* Dritte Abteilung, 1. Hälfte, Strassburg, 1906, p. 108; Professor W. Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch,* Dritte und Vierte Verbesserte Aufl., Heidelberg, 1910, pp. 174-175

(chiefly on this construction in Gothic); and Professor H. Naumann's *Notkers Boethius: Untersuchungen über Quellen und Stil* (= *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker,* CXXI), Strassburg, 1913, p. 79.[15]

As with reference to the Absolute Construction in Gothic, so here with reference to this construction in High German scholars fall into two groups. A few scholars of great distinction hold, or seem to hold, that the absolute dative is an idiom native to the Germanic languages as a whole (exclusive of Old Saxon), to Old High German as to Gothic, though in each instance foreign influence was somewhat felt. This view is held, I take it, by Professor Winkler and by Professor Streitberg, though neither speaks specifically of the construction in Old High German. But what each says of the native development of the Dative Absolute in Gothic, is equally applicable, with only trifling modifications, to the Absolute Dative in Old High German; hence I have put them down as favoring the native development of this construction in Old High German as well as in Gothic. The grounds for Professor Streitberg's belief have been quoted in full in my discussion of this idiom in Gothic, p. 15 above, and need not be repeated here; and, as there stated, the view of Professor Winkler is in substantial accord with that of Professor Streitberg.

I do not feel sure as to the position of Professor Wunderlich, but the words quoted below, *l. c.,* p. 392, lead me to believe that he leans to the native-origin theory: "Wo das attributive Partizip mit Substantiven sich verbindet, die im freien Genetiv oder Dativ dem Satze sich angliedern, entsteht ungezwungen eine Fügung, die dem lat. Ablativ absolutus entspricht; vgl. die

[15] I regret to say that, on account of the European War, I have not been able to obtain Dr. J. Mühlau's *Zur Frage nach der Gotischen Psalmenuebersetzung,* a Kiel dissertation of 1904; Dr. P. Ebeling's *Der Syntaktische Gebrauch der Participia in der Kudrun,* in a Halle a. S. Program of 1912; and, above all, Dr. J. von Guericke's *Die Entwickelung des Althochdeutschen Participiums unter dem Einfluss des Lateinischen,* a Königsberg i. Pr. dissertation of 1915.

Beispiele aus der althochdeutschen Uebersetzerlitteratur in meinen Beiträgen zum Notker'schen Boethius, S. 82. In unserem *während des Krieges* liegt noch der alte Genetiv *währendes Krieges* vor, dem Fügungen wie *in währendem Kriege* zur Seite stehen; vgl. Grimm S. 1085 ff.; vgl. *welche, wie ich deutlich verspüre, währenden Redens bereits in mir aufgestiegen ist,* Immermann, Münchhausen 2, 288 (vgl. unten Teil II, Kapitel 1)." Nor do I feel certain as to the position of Professor Wilmanns (*l. c.,* p. 108), although, from his statement given below, I suppose that he belongs to the second group, discussed in our next paragraph: "Sehr kräftig hat sich der Gebrauch satzartiger Partizipia im Griechischen und Lateinischen entfaltet, am freiesten äussert er sich in den absoluten Partizipialkonstruktionen. In den germanischen Sprachen finden sich zu den absoluten Partizipien nur geringe Ansätze; andere, die sich der Konstruktion des Satzes einfügen (appositive Partizipia), begegnen häufig zu jeder Zeit, gehören aber doch mehr der Kunst- und Schriftsprache an und stehen oft sichtlich unter dem Einfluss fremder Originale und Muster." Dr. Mensing, *l. c.,* pp. 273-274, as in the case of Gothic, seems to stand midway between the two schools.

The second group of scholars hold that in High German the Absolute Dative was borrowed from the Latin, though, in the view of some of them, possibly slightly helped along by some tendencies within the language itself. To this group belong the remaining scholars mentioned at the beginning of this section. The late Professor Mourek, *l. c.,* pp. 35-37, gives detailed statistics of the Absolute Dative in Tatian, and speaks of "der undeutschen construction des absoluten dativs, die dem lat. abl. abs. sklavisch nachgeahmt, aber ungemein häufig belegt ist." Dr. Delbrück, *l. c.,* p. 495, declares: "Im Altnordischen und Althochdeutschen gilt er ebenfalls als Eindringling." [16] Dr. C. W. Eastman, *l. c.,* p. 41, thus speaks of the Absolute Dative in Notker: "Diese Verbindung des Dativs eines No-

[16] The whole passage is quoted above, in my section on the Absolute Dative in Gothic.

mens mit einem Part. Praet. oder Part. Praes. kann keinesfalls als eine echt ahd. Construction angesehen werden," a judgment based on a minute comparison of the Old High German text of several of Notker's works with their Latin originals. Dr. J. B. Crenshaw, *l. c.*, pp. 9 and 11, gives some illuminating statistics as to the Dative Absolute in Old High German. For the Present Participle in this construction the figures are as follows: Otfrid, 1; Isidor, 2; Tatian, 45; Notker, 65; total 113; of which examples 95 translate a Latin Ablative Absolute. For the Preterite Participle the figures are: Otfrid, 2; Isidor, 2; Tatian, 71; Notker, 28; total, 103; of which examples only one is original in the German, the remaining 102 being due to Latin influence. Dr. Crenshaw sums up the matter on page 13: " The results reached by Dr. Morgan Callaway in his thesis, *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* are accordingly abundantly substantiated for the Dative Absolute in German. The construction in question is directly borrowed from the Latin, and is the result of an attempt to graft on to German the Ablative Absolute of the Latin. The attempt failed because the trend of German syntax was not in that direction. The construction is, therefore, limited to the period characterized by translations from Latin and does not become an integral part of classical German syntax." Dr. Manthey, *l. c.*, p. 34, speaks thus of the construction in Notker's *Martianus Capella:* " Der Dativus absolutus ist eine genaue Nachamung des lateinischen Ablativus absolutus und steht im M. Cap. auch nicht ein einziges Mal selbständig." Dr. Göcking, *l. c.*, p. 27, gives statistics for Notker's *Boethius* as well as for his *Martianus Capella,* and likewise declares that the Absolute Dative is borrowed from the Latin. Dr. K. Meyer, *l. c.*, p. 62, quotes approvingly this statement from Rannow: " Auch die Konstr. des dat. abs. mag von aussen eingedrungen und zu gewissen Zeiten, wie schon Ulphilas zeigt, nicht einmal selten in Anwendung gekommen sein, aber volles Bürgerrecht hat sie in der deutschen Sprachen nie erhalten." Finally, Professor H. Naumann, *l. c.*, p. 79, as recently as 1913 spoke thus of Notker's Latinized style,

especially as exhibited in his use of the infinitive and of the participle, and in so doing differentiated the earlier stage of Old High German from the later stage thereof, represented by Notker: "In der alten Schule waren der Abl. absol. häufig vermieden oder aufgelöst, das Partic. conj. gleichfalls oft aufgelöst, beide vielfach auch beibehalten; die Infinitivkonstruktienen sind bis auf wenige Fälle vermieden. In der Folgezeit (Exhortatio; Weissenburger Katechismus;—Trierer Kapitulare) ist vielleicht eine leise Steigerung der Bewahrungstendenz bemerkbar. Notker nun übertrifft noch die ältere Schule; der Acc. c. Inf. ist selten aufgelöst; der Abl. abs. sehr oft nachgeahmt, doch sind die Fälle, wo er aufgelöst ist, immerhin zahlreicher; das Partic. conj. ward sehr oft beibehalten, oft auch ohne Vorlage angewandt, doch oft auch aufgelöst. Dazu kommt die vollendete Hypotaxe, auch ein Merkmal literarischer, vom Latein gelernter Syntax; desgl. die fast völlige Vermeidung des verbalen und auch des substantivischen Asyndetons, das doch ein Charakteristikum der älteren deutschen volkstümlichen Redeweise war. Übrigens weichen die Stellen aus Notkers eigener Feder sehr wesentlich von dieser lateinischen Diktion ab." And in his recently published *Kurze Historische Syntax der Deutschen Sprache* (1915), p. 14, Professor Naumann is no less pronounced for the Latin origin of this construction in Old High German as a whole: "Der reine Dat. absol. im Ahd. (ohne Präposition) gilt als eine Nachahmung des lateinischen Abl. absol.: *bin gote helphante thero arabeito zi ente; bislozanen thinen turin.* Diese Konstruktion gehört zum gelehrten Stil der ahd. Autoren; aber sie blieb ohne Einfluss auf die Zukunft, denn bereichern kann der Stil die Syntax nicht."

I have given this rather detailed summary of opinion as to the origin of the Dative Absolute in Old High German because I desire to show how many different special investigators of this construction in Old High German have independently come to the same conclusion, that the idiom is borrowed from the Latin. To me the evidence given by these investigators seems conclusive for the theory of the foreign (Latin) origin of this

construction in Old High German, although it is still possible that certain native tendencies in Old High German such as those indicated by Messrs. Winkler and Streitberg for Gothic, may have been of secondary, but not, as claimed by them, of primary, help.

As to the Middle High German, Dr. Crenshaw, *l. c.*, p. 10, declares that " In Middle High German no clear instance of the construction [the Dative Absolute] is found; only two where the use seems probable." The absolute Dative is not mentioned by Professor H. Paul in his *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik,* 9th ed., Halle, 1913, or by Professor V. Michels, in his *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch,* 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1912.

Nor is the Dative Absolute found in New High German, but only the Accusative Absolute. Concerning the latter, see Blatz, *l. c.*, pp. 354-357, and my section on the Accusative Absolute below.

In Old Saxon, no instance is recorded of the Absolute Dative: see Dr. H. Pratje's " Syntax des Heliand, I. Das Verbum," in the *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Niederdeutsche Sprachforschung* for 1885, XI, 1886, pp. 74-84, and Professor O. Behaghel's *Die Syntax des Heliand,* Wien, 1897, §§ 107-108.

To sum up the matter: Gothic, Old Norse, Old High German, Middle High German, and Old Saxon, like Old Northumbrian, all point to the foreign origin of the Dative Absolute in the Germanic languages as a whole.

B. The Absolute Accusative

Several scholars have called attention to the fact that the Accusative is occasionally used Absolutely with a Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in *Mat.* 9.18: ðas *hine sprecende* to him *uel* ðæm, heonu aldormonn an geneolecde = Haec *illo loquente* ad eos ecce princeps unus accessit (Rushw. and W. S.: sfv.). In 1857, K. W. Bouterwek, in his *Die Vier Evangelien in Altnordhumbrischer Sprache,* Gütersloh, p. cv, cited four

examples [17] of the idiom; in 1866, George Waring, in the "Prolegomena" to *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels,* 4 vols., Durham, 1854-1866, independently cited one example (*L.* 8.49: illo loquente = hine sprecende), and commented: "Here the use of *hine* as a dative is to be noted"; and, in 1899, Jacob Schipper, in his *König Alfreds Uebersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte,* Leipzig, 1897-1899, p. xliii, quoted two other examples.[18] But no one of these three scholars seemed to be aware of the frequency of this idiom in Northumbrian; nor has the fact of the occurrence of the idiom in this dialect been generally incorporated in the treatises dealing with Anglo-Saxon syntax. I regret to add that the fact was not known to me when I wrote my dissertation on *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon* (West-Saxon), Baltimore, 1889; indeed, I did not learn the fact until several years ago, when I began these studies in the syntax of the Northumbrian dialect.

About twenty-one examples [19] of this idiom have been found in the Northumbrian, a construction unknown in the West-Saxon,[20] for, as I have tried to show in my dissertation, the cases hitherto cited as examples of the absolute accusative in West-Saxon are to be explained otherwise,—a conviction in no wise upset by my later discovery of the use of the absolute accusative in the Northumbrian. The number of examples found of this idiom precludes one's first impression that the use of the accusative in the gloss is due merely to carelessness.

[17] *Mat.* 8.34: *uiso eo = gesene hine; L.* 20.1: *docente illo = lærende hine; ib.* 22.47, 60: *eo loquente = hine sprecende.*

[18] *J.* 4.51: *eo descendente = hine stigende; ib.* 8.30: hæc *illo loquente* = ðas *hine spreccende.*

[19] In all of these examples except one (*L.* 23.8[a]), the subject of the participle is a pronoun, and the form of the subject is indisputably accusative. In *L.* 23.8[a] the noun subject (*hælend*) is preceded by the accusative of the article, ðone.

[20] In the third edition of his *Historische Syntax,* 1916, p. 59, Professor Eugen Einenkel expresses the belief that, in late Old English (Anglo-Saxon), a few genuine cases occur of the Absolute Accusative, but he does not cite any example of this idiom in Anglo-Saxon that seems certain to me.

That the accusative here is a genuine Northumbrian idiom seems indicated, also, by several other facts. (1) Once the dative and the accusative are given as alternatives in the absolute construction, in *Mk.* 14.43: ða get *uel* ða geon *him uel hine sprecende* cuom iudas = athuc *eo loquente* uenit iudas (W. S.: dat. abs.; Rushw.: dat. abs. (crude)). (2) The accusative is used in several other constructions in which normally (in West-Saxon, at least) the dative occurs, as (*a*) after the comparative degree of adjectives; (*b*) after the preposition *mid* (*mið*), as has been long known; (*c*) after the verb *to be* for the dative of interest; (*d*) after *sella* for the dative of the indirect object (or of interest?); (*e*) after *gedæfniga* for the dative of reference. Conversely, (*f*) after *geceiga,* 'call,' which in West-Saxon has the accusative only, we find occasionally the dative, though usually the accusative. Examples are:—

(*a*) *L.* 3.16: cymeð ðonne *strongra mec* (*sic*) = ueniet autem *fortior me;*—*J.* 14.28: forðon se fæder *mara mec* (*sic*) is = quia pater *maior me* est. [Or is the accusative here due to the Glossator's mistaking *me,* ablative, for *me,* accusative?]

(*b*) *J.* 8.29: seðe mec sende *mec* (*sic*) *mið* is = qui me misit *mecum* est. [Concerning the regimen of *mid,* see Erla Hittle, *Zur Geschichte der Altenglischen Präpositionen "Mid" und "Wið"* (= *Anglistische Forschungen,* Heft II), Heidelberg, 1901, pp. 6-7. Dr. Hittle refers to Miller's Bede, and declares that the accusative with *mid* is a chief characteristic of the Northumbrian (Mercian) dialect.

(*c*) *J.* 21.22: cueð him to se hælend ðus *uel* suæ hine ic uillo geuuni *uel* ðætte he gewuniga oð ðæt ic cymo huæd is ðe bi ðy *uel is ðec* (*sic*) ðæs? ðu mec soec *uel* fylig ðu me = dicit ei iesus sic eum uolo manere donec ueniam, quid *ad te?* tu me sequere.—For a striking parallel to this in Old High German, compare *Tatian* 45.2: waz *ist thih* thes inti *mih?* = quid *mihi* et *tibi est?* and see the comment thereon by Arthur Köhler, "Ueber den Syntaktischen Gebrauch des Dativ im Gotischen," in *Germania,* XI, 1866, p. 288.

(*d*) *Mat.* 26.67: ða speafton in onsione his &— [= blank]

hine slogun oðro ðonne hondbreodo in onsione *hine* (*sic*) *saldon* = Tunc expuerunt in faciem eius et colaphis eum caederunt alii autem palmas in faciem *ei dederunt*.

(*e*) *J.* 3.30 *hine* uel *him gedæfnað* ðætte auexe *mec* uutudlice ðæt ic lytlege = *illum oportet* crescere *me* autem minui (Rushw.: *him gidæfnað* etc.; W. S.: hit geburað ðæt he weaxe etc.). The accusative is doubtless partly due to the presence of the accusative (*illum*) in the Latin.

(*f*) *L.* 19.15: heht *geceiga* ðæm *esnum uel* ða esnas ðæm gesalde ðæt feh = iussit *uocari seruos* quibus dedit pecuniam; *L.* 14.13: ah miððy ðu doest gebærscip *geceig ðorfendum unhalum haltum blindum* = sed cum facis conuiuium *uoca pauperes debiles clodos caecos; L.* 15.6: cuom to hus *uel* to ham *geceigeð* uel *geceigde friondum* & *neheburum* = ueniens domum *conuocat amicos* et *uicinos*. In twelve other citations for *geceiga* given by Professor Cook, it governs an accusative: *Mat.* 1.21, 23; 9.13; 10.25; 23.9;—*L.* 1.13, 31, 62; 14.9, 12;—*J.* I. 5.3; 9.18; 13.13; and in five others, it has no object: *Mat.* 8.29; 14.26;—*Mk.* 15.13, 14;—*L.* 1.42.

In a word, there seems to have been an interchange of the accusative and the dative in Northumbrian that is unknown in West-Saxon; of which interchange the accusative absolute offers the most striking illustration.

After writing the foregoing paragraph concerning the interchange of dative and accusative in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* I came upon this statement by the late Dr. Henry Sweet concerning the confusion of cases in the Northumbrian and Mercian dialects: "The peculiar feature of the Northumbrian and Mercian dialects is their combination of archaism and disintegration, which can only be compared with that of Southern English in the twelfth century. We find the same confusion of genders (*ðæs mæhtes,* pl. *burgas,* etc.), of cases (*heom* acc. in Rush.), of strong and weak (*ðæs lichomes*)." [21] Of the falling

[21] The quotation is taken from Dr. Sweet's "Dialects and Prehistoric Forms of Old English," which originally appeared in the *Transactions of the Philological Society,* 1875-1876, pp. 543-569, and was subsequently re-

together of certain cases of nouns in Northumbrian, Professor Uno Lindelöf tells us in his "Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Alt-Northumbrischen," Helsingfors, 1893. On p. 299 he speaks as follows of the Feminine Nouns: "Im Singular fallen der Nominativ und der Accusativ formell zusammen," probably out of analogy to masculine and neuter nouns, he explains. He then declares that, although the Dative ending is usually preserved in Feminine Nouns, "Es sind aber doch einzelne Spuren von Zusammenfall des Dativs mit dem Nominativ und Accusativ vorhanden, ein Vorgang, der sich in der Entwickelung des Nordenglischen jedenfalls bald vollzog." And it is well known, of course, that in the Modern Scotch dialects there is great confusion of cases in the pronouns. In his *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland,* London, 1873, p. 187, Dr. J. A. H. Murray speaks of the matter as follows: "The usage of the Personal Pronouns in the current Scottish dialects differs essentially from that of the Standard English, being in most respects identical with the French. There is a *direct* or proper *Nominative,* and a direct *Objective,* as well as an *indirect* case, used like the French *moi, toi, lui, eux,* for both Nominative and Objective in certain positions. But while in French this indirect case or *dative* is in its history and derivation distinct from the direct accusative, the indirect case in Scotch is, viewed etymologically, really the objective of the English (the dative or accusative of the Anglo-Saxon), while the direct Objective is a contracted or mutilated form." And, on p. 189, he tells us that "The Indirect form is used for the Nominative (1) when the Verb is not expressed, as in answer to a question (so in French); (2) when the Nominative is separated from the Verb by a Relative or Relative Clause, a numeral or a substantive (so in French); (3) as the second Nominative (predicate) after the verb *to be* (so in French); (4) when the Nominative is repeated for the sake of emphasis, the added nominative being put in the indi-

printed in the *Collected Papers of Henry Sweet,* Oxford, 1913, pp. 185-211. The passage given above I have quoted from the *Collected Papers,* p. 197.

rect case (so in French); (5) when two or more nominatives form the subject of the same verb (so in French); (6) with a participle as the absolute case." This statement of Dr. Murray is confirmed by the later investigations in this general field, as by Dr. G. H. Cowling, in *The Dialect of Hackness (North-East Yorkshire)*, Cambridge, 1915, p. 120, and by Sir James Wilson, in *Lowland Scotch as Spoken in the Lower Strathearn District of Perthshire,* Oxford, 1915, pp. 83-86. Whether or not Dr. Murray intends to attribute the interchange of cases in Scotch to French influence, is not clear to me. Dr. Otto Diehn, in his *Die Pronomina im Frühmittelenglischen,* Heidelberg, 1901, p. 50, attributes the occasional interchange of dative and accusative forms of pronouns in Early Middle English partly to the analogy of nouns (in which dative and accusative had become identical) and partly to Scandinavian (especially Danish) influence. Concerning the latter factor he mentions an oral suggestion of Professor Sarrazin, and refers to Professor Jespersen's *Progress in Language,* London, 1894, pp. 182 ff., in which latter a general suggestion is made as to the possible influence of the Scandinavian languages on the English in the matter of interchange of case-forms. A very violent substitution in Modern Scandinavian, well known but not mentioned by Professor Jespersen, is the use of the accusative (*den*) of the article for the nominative (*der*). In his later work, *Growth and Structure of the English Language,* 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1912, §§ 80-81, Professor Jespersen returns to the topic, but adds nothing of importance. Concerning the confusion of the nominative and of the dative of personal pronouns in Middle English and in Modern English, see, also, Professor F. B. Gummere's interesting article, "On the English Dative-Nominative of the Personal Pronoun," in *The American Journal of Philology,* IV, 1883, pp. 283-290.

The examples of the Absolute Accusative are in full as follows (21):—

I. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE (18)

The Accusative of the Absolute Present Participle ends normally in *-nde* and once in *-end,* and is found in the singular, masculine, only. Compare Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 527, 532, and 535.

bodiga, *preach* (1) : *L.* (1) : 20.1[b]: lærende *hine* ðæt folc in temple & *bodande* efnecuomon ða alldormenn = docente *illo* populum in templo et *euangelizante* conuenerunt principes. [Rushw.: cfv.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

fara, *go away, depart* (2) : *Mk.* (1) : 10.46: mið ðy foerde he *uel hine færende* in ða burug . . . blind gesaet = *proficiscente eo* hiericho . . . caecus sedebat iuxta uiam. [Rushw.: cfv.; W. S.: cfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]—*L.* (1) : 19.36: *færende* ðonne *hine* underbræddon *uel* legdon gegerelo hiora on woege = *eunte* autem *illo* substernebant uestimenta sua in uia. [Rushw.: *færende* ðonne *hine;* W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

ofstiga, *ascend* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 8.23: & *ofstigende hine uel* ða he ofstag in lytlum scipe . . . gefylgdon hine *uel* him ðegnas his = Et *ascendente eo* in nauicula secuti sunt eum discipuli eius. [Rushw.: & ða stag he; W. S.: & he astah.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

ræsta, *recline* (1): *Mat.* (1): 9.10: & geworden wæs *ræstende hine* in hus . . . monigo . . . cuomun geræstun = Et factum est *discumbente eo* in domo . . . multi . . . uenientes discumbebant. [Rushw.: cfv.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

spreca, *speak, declare* (10) : *Mat.* (3) : 9.18: ðas *hine sprecende* to him *uel* ðæm heonu aldormonn an geneolecde = Haec *illo loquente* ad eos ecce princeps unus accessit. [Rushw.: ða he ðis spræc; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *Mat.* 17.5[a]: ða gett *uel* geana *hine sprecende uel* forðor he wæs sprecende heonu wolcen leht oferscyade hia = athuc *eo loquente* ecce nubis lucida obumbrauit eos. [Rushw.: sfv.; W. S.: dat.

abs.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *Mat.* 12.46ª: geonæ *hine uel* he spræc *uel sprœcend* to menigom heonu moder his & broðero stondas *uel* gestodon = Athuc *eo loquente* ad turbas ecce mater eius et fratres stabant foris. [Rushw.: sfv.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]—*Mk.* (2): 5.35ª: ða geone *hine uel* he *sprecende* cuomon . . . aldermenn = adhuc *eo loquente* ueniunt etc. [Rushw.: ða geona *he sprecende* comon etc.; W. S.: dat. abs.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *Mk.* 14.43: ða get *uel* ða geon him uel *hine sprecende* cuom iudas = athuc *eo loquente* uenit iudas. [Rush.: dat. abs. (crude); W. S.: dat. abs.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.]—*L.* (4): 8.49: ðageane *hine spreccende*— (= blank) from aldormonn somnunges cuoeð him = athuc *illo loquente* uenit a principe synagogae dicens. [Rushw.: geona *hine sprecende* com . . . cwæð; W. S.: dat. abs.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *L.* 9.34ª: ðas ða *hine sprecende* aworden wæs wolcen = haec autem *illo loquente* facta est nubis. [Rushw.: sfv. (?); W. S.: sfv.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *L.* 22.47: forðor ðaget *hine spreccende* heono ðæt here *uel* ða menigo = Athuc *eo loquente* ecce turba. [Rushw.: to him *sprecende* heono ðe here & seðe giceged wæs iudas; W. S.: dat. abs.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.] *L.* 22.60: sona forðor ða get *hine sprecende* gesang se hona = continuo athuc *illo loquente* cantauit gallus. [Rushw.: sona forðor ðagett *hine sprecende* ðe hona gisang; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.]—*J.* (1): 8.30: ðas *hine spreccende uel* miððy he wæs sprecende menigo gelefdon on him = haec *illo loquente* multi crediderunt in eum. [Rushw.: ðas *hine sprecende* monige gilefdun in hine; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

stiga, *descend* (1): *J.* (1): 4.51ª: gee uutudlice *hine stigende uel* soðlice miððy ðe geade . . . gwurnun him togægnes = iam autem *eo descendente* serui occurrerunt ei. [Rushw.: *gisœh* wutudlice hine *stigende* esnas giurnon togægnes him; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.]

wyrca, *work, do* (1): *Mat.* (1): 6.3: ðu *uel ðeh* uutedlice

wyrcende ða ællmissa nyta winstra ðin huæt wyrcas *uel* doas suiðra ðin = *te* autem *faciente* aelemosyna nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua. [Rushw.: dat. abs.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.]

NOTES

1. *An Abortive Attempt at the Absolute Accusative* occurs possibly in *Mat.* 24.3: *wæs sittende* uutedlice he *uel hine* ofer mor oleuetes geneolecdon to him ðegnas = *Sedente* autem *eo* super montem oliueti accesserunt ad eum discipuli (Rushw.: sæt ða he; W. S.: Ða he sæt).

II. THE PRETERITE PARTICIPLE (3)

The Accusative of the Absolute Preterite Participle ends in *-ne,* and is found in the singular, masculine, only. Compare Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 549.

(ge)sea, *see* (3): *Mat.* (1): 8.34: *gesene hine uel* ða hine gesegon gebedon ðæt ofereade = et *uiso eo* rogabant ut transiret. [Rushw.: & *geseende hine* bedun hine ðæt he ferde; W. S.: sfv.—Professor Cook considers *gesene,* here and in the two passages quoted below, an adjective (and inadvertently as ns.). It may be an adjective, but, if so, it is probably accusative singular masculine, and we have an absolute phrase made up of an adjective plus a pronoun instead of a participle plus a pronoun. As, however, according to Professor Cook, at least three clear examples (*Mat.* I. 8.17, 25.29; *L.* 22.24) occur of *geseen* as the past participle in the nominative singular, I do not see why *gesene* may not here be considered a participle instead of an adjective. Dr. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 480, considers *gesene* an adjective, but assigns no case to it in this passage.] *L.* (2): 10.31: *gesene hine* biwærlde = *uiso illo* præteriuit. [Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: sfv.] *L.* 23.8[a]: herodes ðonne *gesene* ðone *hælend* glæd wæs suiðe = herodes autem *uiso iesu* gauisus est ualde. [Rushw.: herodes ðone *gesene* ðone *hælend* glæd wæs swiðe; W. S.: sfv.]

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

That the Absolute Construction with the Accusative is due to the influence of the Latin original, seems likely from the fact that in each instance it occurs in translation of a Latin ablative absolute; or, rather, the absolute construction is due to the Latin influence, the fact that the accusative is so used seems due to the Northumbrian interchange of dative and accusative discussed above. Finally, it should be added that the glossator at times gives as an alternative rendering the native idiom of a subordinated finite verb (as in *Mat.* 8.23: *ofstigende hine uel ða he ofstag* = *ascendente eo*) or of a co-ordinated finite verb (as in *Mat.* 17.5[a]: ða gett *uel* geana *hine sprecende uel* forðor he *wæs sprecende* = athuc *eo loquente*),—a fact that further attests the ungenuineness of the absolute construction.

APPENDIX II

THE ABSOLUTE ACCUSATIVE IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

In his Gotisches *Elementarbuch,* 3rd and 4th edition, Heidelberg, 1910, § 251, Professor Streitberg speaks as follows of a possible Absolute Accusative in Gothic: "Einen Akkusativus absolutus nimmt man an auf Grund von M. 6.3 *þuk taujandan armaion, ni witi hleidumei þeina hva taujiþ taihswo þeina* = σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντος ἐλεημοσύνην und Mc. 6.22 *atgaggandein inn dauhtar Herodiadins jah plinsjandein jah galeikandein Heroda jah þaim miþanakumbjandam, qaþ þiudans du þizai maujai* = εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρός . . . καὶ ὀρχησαμένης καὶ ἀρεσάσης τῷ Ἡρῴδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις, εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῷ κορασίῳ. Im zweiten Beispiel stellt man gewöhnlich durch die Änderung **dauhtr* einen Dativ absol. her; im ersten lässt man den Akkusativ von *witi* abhängen, doch befriedigt diese Aushilfe nicht. Vgl. Rückert S. 416, Lucke S. 26 f." Despite this statement of Professor Streitberg, I am loth to consider these two passages genuine instances of the Absolute Accusative, not only because their genuineness has, as stated by Professor Streitberg, been questioned by several eminent Gothic

scholars, but also because the Absolute Accusative is most probably not a native idiom in the other Germanic languages. See, further, H. Winkler, *Germanische Casussyntax,* p. 124, and M. J. van der Meer, *Gotische Casussyntaxis,* § 38.

Concerning the Absolute Accusative in New High German, which, according to Blatz, is most probably not a survival of the dative absolute, but a new importation from the French, see F. Blatz, *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik,* 3rd ed., Karlsruhe, 1895-1896, Vol. II, pp. 354-357; T. Matthias, "Zur Geschichte der Deutschen Mittelwortfügungen," in the *Zeitschrift für den Deutschen Unterricht,* XI, 1897, pp. 694-705; W. Wilmanns, *Deutsche Grammatik,* Dritte Abtheilung, 1. Hälfte, Strassburg, 1906, p. 108; and the references given in *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 33.

For the Absolute Accusative in the Low Germanic languages, see J. Verdam, "Absolute Naamvallen in 't M. Ndl. en Ndl.," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde,* II, 1882, pp. 188-198; W. L. van Helten, "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: VIII. Nog iets over de Absolute Naamvallen," in the same journal, V, 1885, pp. 207-220; and F. A. Stoett, *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst: Syntaxis,* 2nd ed., 1909, pp. 127 ff. (in the 1889 ed. pp. 34 ff.). Dr. Stoett tells us that this construction in Middle Dutch is borrowed from the French. With this statement compare J. W. Bright, "The Objective Absolute in English," in *Modern Language Notes,* V, 1890, pp. 80-81; C. H. Ross, *The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English,* a Johns Hopkins dissertation of 1893; and Eugen Einenkel, *Historische Syntax,* Strassburg, 1916, pp. 58-60.

C. The Absolute Nominative

A few sporadic examples (about ten in all) occur of what appears to be an Absolute Construction in the Nominative Case, an idiom unknown in West-Saxon, as I have tried to show in my aforementioned dissertation. A typical example is found in *Matthew* 1.20: ðas soðlice ðe *he ðencende uel* ðohte ða cuom

heno engel drihtnes in suoefnum *uel* in slepe ætdeaude him = haec autem *eo cogitante* ecce angelus domini in somnis apparuit ei (W. S.: dat. abs.; Rushw.: cfv.). In these Northumbrian examples it is difficult to decide whether the nominative is due merely to errors in case-relations (an error of a sort not infrequent in these gospels), or whether the glossator thought the nominative grammatically allowable. Personally I am inclined to believe that the nominative is due to contamination, or, better, to the mixture of two constructions. In several of the examples, as in the one just quoted, the glossator gives two alternative constructions, (1) the finite verb and (2) the participle, the former calling for a nominative and the latter for an oblique case, but, in these sporadic instances of the nominative absolute, he gives us—in all but three examples—the nominative only. In these three exceptional instances we find the nominative interchanging with the accusative: in *Mat.* 6.3, 12.46, and *Mk.* 5.35, all quoted below and also under the Absolute Accusative. In nine of the examples, the Latin original has the ablative absolute; in one (*Mk.* I. 5.3) the Latin has an appositive dative of the participle, but the glossator has mistaken the dative of the noun (*scribæ*) for the nominative, plural.

The examples of the Nominative Absolute are in full as follows:—

I. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE (6)

The Nominative of the Absolute Present Participle ends normally in *-nde,* occasionally in *-nd.* Compare Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 527, 532, 534, and 538.

fregna, *enquire* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 5.3: *ða boecere* of bod æs *fregnende* twufald lufes ædeawde = *Scribæ* de mandato legis *interroganti* geminum dilectionis ostendit. [Cook: *fregnende,* pres. p.; *boecere,* npm. Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 293, makes *boecere* nominative, plural, masculine, but does not cite *fregnende.* So far as its form is concerned, *boecere* could be a dative, singular; and, of course, *fregnende* could be a dative-instrumental, singular, masculine; accordingly, at first I put this example

under the appositive use. But, as *boecere* is preceded by *ða*, the noun was probably intended for the plural by the glossator, who mistook *scribæ* for the nominative, plural, instead of the dative, singular; I do not feel sure as to what case he intended *fregnende* to be in.

geonga, *go* (1): *Mat.* (1): 9.27: & *geongende uel* ða geeode ðona ðe *hælend* gefylgdon hine *uel* him tuoege bisene *uel* blinde = Et *transeunte* inde *iesu* secuti sunt eum duo caeci. [Rushw.: cfv.; W. S.: sfv.—Professor Cook does not classify noun or participle here, nor does Dr. Carpenter.]

spreca, *speak* (2): *Mat.* (1): 12.46[a]: geonæ hine *uel he* spræcc *uel sprœcend* to menigom heonu moder his & broðero stondas *uel* gestodon = Athuc *eo loquente* ad turbas ecce mater eius et fratres stabant foris. [Rushw.: sfv.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not cited.] *Mk.* (1): 5.35[b]: ða geone hine *uel he sprecende* cuomon . . . aldormenn = adhuc *eo loquente* ueniunt etc. [Rushw.: ða geona *he sprecende* comon.—Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited.]

ðenca, *think* (1): *Mat.* (1): 1.20: ðas soðlice ðe *he ðencende uel* ðohte ða cuom heno engel drihtnes in suoefnum *uel* in slepe ætdeaude him = haec autem *eo cogitante* ecce angelus domini in somnis apparuit ei. [Rushw.: cfv.; W. S.: dat. abs.—Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter: not classified.]

wyrca, *work, do* (1): *Mat.* (1): 6.3: *ðu uel* ðeh uutedlice *wyrcende* ða ællmissa nyta winstra ðin huæt wyrcas *uel* doas suiðra ðin = *te* autem *faciente* aelmosyna nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua. [Rushw.: dat. abs.; W. S.: sfv.—Cook: not classified; Carpenter: not classified.]

II. THE PRETERITE PARTICIPLE (4)

The Nominative of the Absolute Preterite Participle ends, in the singular, in *-d* or in *-en;* in the plural, in *-do* or in *-de.*

eftasægca, *say, relate* (1): *L.* (1): I. 5.4: soecende of niming hera in sabatum *eftasægd* dauid *bisen* forcuom = Quærentes de uulsione spicarum in sabbatis *relato* dauid *exem-*

plo conuincit (or predicate nominative?). [Cook: *eftasægd,* pp.; *bisen,* nsfn.; Carpenter: not cited.]

forleta, *leave* (1): *L.* (1): 10.30^{b}: fromfoerdon half *cwic uel lifigiende forleten* = abierunt *semiuiuo relicto.* [Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: cfv.—Cook: *forleten,* pp.; half-cwic, " asm.? " Carpenter: not cited.]

(ge)ceiga, *call* (1): *Mk.* (1): 3.23: & *efne geceigdo ða ilco uel* miððy geceigd weron ða ilco in bispellum cuoeð he = *conuocatis eis* in parabolis dicebat. [Rushw.: & *efne gicegde ða ilcv* in bispellum cwæð; W. S.: cfv.—Cook: *efnegeceigdo,* npm.; *ilco* not cited for this passage; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 554: *efnegeceigdo,* npm.]

(ge)clænsiga, *cleanse* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.8: tea *uel* teno *hreafo geclænsade* an . . . to ðongunge gewoende = Decem *leprosis mundatis* unus . . . reuertitur. [*Geclænsade* may be indicative preterite, 3rd sg., as Professor Cook holds. Carpenter: not cited.]

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

As already incidentally indicated, the Absolute Nominative is in each instance suggested by the ablative absolute of the Latin original, and seems to arise from a mixture of constructions, the glossator wavering in his rendering of the absolute participle of the Latin between a finite verb, which requires a nominative as its subject, and an absolute participle, which requires an oblique case.

APPENDIX III

THE ABSOLUTE NOMINATIVE IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

By scholars of no slight distinction it has several times been claimed that we have two examples of the Absolute Nominative in Gothic, namely, in *Mark* 6.21: jah waurþans dags gatils = *καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου* and in *John* 11.44: urrann sa dauþa gabundans handuns jah fotuns faskjam jah wlits is auralja bibundans = *καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο.* Although the absolute nominative is contended for here, among others, by so distinguished a scholar as Professor

Streitberg (in his *Gotisches Elementarbuch,* 3rd and 4th ed., Heidelberg, 1910, § 244), and as Professor Einenkel (in his *Historische Syntax,* 3rd ed., Strasburg, 1916, p. 58), it seems to me that Dr. W. van Helten, in his " Gab es Einen Got. Nominativus Absolutus? " (in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur,* xxxv, 1909, pp. 310-311), has shown that in each passage we probably have some sophistication of the text, and that Ulfilas probably used a finite verb in each. Nor does Dr. Ant. Beer's effort, in his " Gab es Einen Gotischen Nominativus Absolutus? " (in the same periodical, xxxvii, 1911, pp. 169-171), to overthrow the theory advocated but not originated by Dr. van Helten seem to me successful. For other discussions of these two passages, by Gabelentz and Loebe, by Uppström, Bernhardt, Rückert, Gering, and Lücke, see the references given by Professor Streitberg, by Dr. van Helten, and Dr. Beer; also M. J. van der Meer, *Gotische Casussyntaxis,* § 5, b; and *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 31-36.

Concerning alleged examples of the Nominative Absolute in New High German, see F. Blatz, *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik,* ii, pp. 310-311, and T. Matthias, " Zur Geschichte der Deutschen Mittelwortfügungen," pp. 705-708.

On page 40 I give a synoptic table of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* showing the approximate number of examples in the Dative-Instrumental, the Accusative, and the Nominative.

D. The Uses of the Absolute Participle

As in West-Saxon, the chief use of the absolute participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is to denote Time, as in *Mat.* 28.13b: forstelun *uel* stelende weron hine *us slependum* = furati sunt eum *nobis dormientibus; Mat.* 9.18: ðas *hine sprecende* to him *uel* ðæm heonu aldormonn an geneolecde = Haec *illo loquente* ad eos ecce princeps unus accessit (Rushw.: ða he ðis spræc). Almost a hundred examples of this use have been found.

At times the absolute phrase seems to denote an action almost

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

GOSPELS	Dative-Instrumental		Accusative		Nominative		Total Pres. Participle	Total Pret. Participle	Total Pres. and Pret.
	Pres. P.	Pret. P.	Pres. P.	Pret. P.	Pres. P.	Pret. P.			
Matthew:	11	13	6	1	4	..	21	14	35
Gospel.....	4	7	6	1	4	..	14	8	22
Introd'n.....	7*	6	..	..	..	..	7	6	13
Mark:	7	8	3	..	2	1	12	9	21
Gospel.....	5	6	3	..	1	1	9	7	16
Introd'n.....	2	2	..	..	1	..	3	2	5
Luke:	34	9	7	2	..	3	41	14	55
Gospel.....	24	5	7	2	..	1	31	8	39
Introd'n.....	10	4*	..	..	..	2	10	6	16
John:	10	3	2	..	..	..	12	3	15
Gospel.....	..	2	2	..	..	..	2	2	4
Introd'n.....	10	1	..	..	..	..	10	1	11
Totals:	62	33	18	3	6	4	86	40	126
Gospels.....	33	20	18	3	5	2	56	25	81
Introd'ns.....	29	13	..	..	1	2	30	15	45

* Of these 1 = Adj. and Noun.

Co-ordinate with that of the principal verb, a use of the absolute participle corresponding to what I have denominated the co-ordinate use of the appositive participle.[22] Possible examples are seen in *Mk.* 16.20^{b,c}: bodadon eghuær *drihtne miðwyrcende* & ðæt word *trymende* mið fylgendum becenum *uel* tacenum = praedicauerunt ubique *domino co-operante* et sermonem *confirmante* sequentibus signis. Other examples observed are: *Mat.* I. 21.4; I. 19.12^{b};—*L.* I. 8.5^{b}; I. 10.2^{b}; 6.20; 10.30^{b}; 24.47;—*J.* I. 1.13; I. 6.13; I. 8.3^{b}; I. 5.6; I. 6.9^{b}; I. 8.3^{a}.

Occasionally the phrase denotes Manner, as in *Mat.* 17.14: geneolecde to him monn *cneum gewœlteno* before hine cueð = accessit ad eum homo *genibus prouolutis* ante eum dicens. For other examples (all that I observed) see *Mat.* I. 20.20^{c}; I. 17.12; 27.29^{a};—*Mk.* 10.17; 12.20^{a};—*L.* 24.50.

At times the phrase denotes the Cause of the main action, as in *L.* I. 5.10: ðræl gemeð *biddendum* fore hine *ældrum* & *megum* = seruum curat *rogantibus* pro eo *senioribus* et *amicis*. See, too, *Mat.* I. 18.18; 15.12;—*L.* 9.43;—*J.* I. 5.3^{a}: 6.18 (or means ?).

Rarely the phrase denotes Means, as in *Mat.* I. 8.10: æteawas fewr ana *uel* noht mara se reht godspellas to onfoanne & alle wiðerweardra gedwola deada swiðor *slitenum* ðon *ciricendum* hlifienddum *singendum* = ostenditur quattuor tantum debere euangelia suscipi et omnes apocriforum nenias (*sic* for *uenias?*) mortuis magis *hereticis* quam *ecclesiasticis* uiuis *canendis*. See, also, *Mat.* I. 16.3^{b};—*L.* I. 5.4.

Rarely, too, the phrase denotes Concession, as in *J.* 20.26: cuom se hælend *bityndum durum* = uenit iesus *ianuis clausis*. See, too, *Mat.* I. 19.1 (?);—*L.* I. 9.8.

The table below shows, approximately, the distribution of these several uses in the four *Lindisfarne Gospels*. As to the classification of individual examples, of course, there is no little room for difference of opinion.

[22] See *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 285-289.

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE USES OF THE ABSOLUTE PARTICIPLE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

GOSPELS	Co-ord.			Conces.			Temp.			Manner			Means			Cause			Totals	
	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pr.	Pt.	Tot.	Pres.	Past
Matthew: Total	1	1	2	1	..	1	16	8	24	1	3	4	2	..	2	..	2	2	21	14
Dative	1	1	2	1	..	1	6	7	13	1	3	4	2	..	2	..	2	2	11	13
Accus.	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	1	7	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	1
Nom.	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	4	..
Mark: Total	2	..	2	..	..	..	10	7	17	..	2	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	12	9
Dative	2	..	2	..	..	..	5	6	11	..	2	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	8
Accus.	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..
Nom.	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	1	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	1
Luke: Total	4	1	5	..	1	1	35	10	45	..	1	1	..	1	1	2	..	2	41	14
Dative	4	..	4	..	..	..	28	8	36	..	1	1	..	..	..	2	..	2	34	9
Accus.	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	2	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	2
Nom.	..	1	1	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	..	3
John: Total	5	1	6	..	1	1	6	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	2	12	3
Dative	5	1	6	..	1	1	4	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1	2	10	3
Accus.	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	..
Nom.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Totals	12	3	15	1	2	3	67	25	92	1	6	7	2	1	3	3	3	6	86	40

E. Origin of the Idioms with the Absolute Participle: Summary Statement

For the sake of brevity and of convenience, the Origin of the Absolute Participle has been discussed as each case that is used absolutely has been treated. See the preceding sections, especially pp. 2-13 for the Dative-Instrumental; pp. 25-34 for the Accusative; and pp. 35-38 for the Nominative. Here I will only add, by way of general summary, that, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the absolute use of the participle, whether in the normal dative-instrumental case, or in the rarer accusative case, or in the very rare nominative case, corresponds almost without exception to an ablative absolute of the original Latin, and is patently due to Latin influence. The use of the accusative in absolute constructions seems to have arisen from an interchange of the accusative and the dative cases peculiar to the Northumbrian dialect. The use of the nominative in absolute constructions appears to spring from a confusion of constructions, the glossator halting between the use of a finite verb and of an absolute participle, as explained above, p. 36. But that the absolute use of the participle, whether in the dative-instrumental, in the accusative, or the nominative, is not a native Northumbrian idiom, but is due to Latin influence, is attested not only by the fact stated above, namely, that the absolute construction is found only in translation of a Latin absolute participle, but also by this further fact, that in the majority of instances the glossator renders the Latin absolute participle by a finite verb, either co-ordinated or (somewhat less frequently) subordinated. In this preference for the finite verb over the participle, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* stands on the same plane as does the *West-Saxon Gospels,* nay more, as do West-Saxon as a whole and, in all probability, the Germanic languages as a whole. But, while in the *West-Saxon Gospels* the subordinated finite verb is slightly more frequently used than is the co-ordinated finite verb in translation of a Latin absolute participle, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the reverse is true.

But, while, as just stated, the Latin influence in the development of the absolute construction in Northumbrian and in West-Saxon was primary, there was at work a secondary influence of native origin, which is manifested in the expressions made up of a preposition (in Northumbrian usually *miþ*, in West-Saxon *be*) plus a substantive and a participle in the dative-instrumental each, possibly, also (as pointed out for Gothic by Professor Delbrück), of a substantive in the dative of the person interested plus a participle in the dative: see pp. 16-17 above.

CHAPTER II

THE APPOSITIVE PARTICIPLE

Introduction

A participle is used Appositively " when the connection between the participle and its principal is so loose that the two seem to constitute two independent ideas; or, to use the words of Sweet (§ 90): 'When the subordination of an assumptive (attributive) word to its head-word is so slight that the two are almost co-ordinate, the adjunct-word is said to be in apposition to its head-word.' " [1] Typical examples are the following:—*Mat.* 26.7ª: cuom to him wif *hæbbende* stænna fulle smirinisse = accessit ad eum mulier *habens* alabastrum ungenti; *Mat.* 26.10: ða *wittende uel* wiste uutedlice ðe hælend cueð = *sciens* autem iesus ait; *Mat.* 25.9: geonduordon hogo *cuoeðendo* = responderunt prudentes *dicentes.*

As the examples just given show, under the Appositive Participle I include not only the participle that is equivalent to a dependent adverbial clause, but also the participle that is equivalent to a dependent adjectival (relative) clause and the participle that is substantially equivalent to an independent clause. For a detailed discussion of this classification, see, below, the section (C) on " the Uses of the Appositive Participle."

For the light that it throws upon Northumbrian and Germanic syntax, the appositive participle with an accusative [2]

[1] Quoted from *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 143.

[2] In a few instances, I have included under the heading " accusative object " objects that in form are not accusative but that, from the Modern English standpoint, seem to be direct objects, as in *Mk.* 1. 41: gerahte hond his & gehran *uel hrinande him* cueð = extendit manum suam et *tangens* eum ait; and in *L. I.* 5, 6ª, where *hrinendo* governs *him.* In all the examples of *hrina* given by Cook except in these two, it governs the accusative of a noun. The use of *him* here but reenforces what was said above, p. 28, as to the interchange of accusative and dative forms of the pronouns.

object is everywhere separated from the appositive participle without an accusative object,—a distinction obviously of more importance for the present participle than for the preterite participle.

A. The Present Participle

I. with an object

The Present Appositive Participle with an Accusative Object is much more frequent in the Northumbrian Gloss than in the West-Saxon translation of the *Gospels,* 243 examples (299 including the "Introductions") occurring in the former to 122 in the latter.

The following are typical examples:—*Mat.* 10:12: groetas ða ilco ðus *cueðende* etc. = salutate eam *dicentes* etc.; *Mat.* 26.27[a]: & *genimmende calic* ðoncunco dyde = Et *accipiens calicem* gratias egit; *Mat.* 8.28: geurnon him tuoege *hæbbende uel* hæfdon *diobles* = occurrerunt ei duo *habentes* daemonia.

The statistics in full of the Present Appositive Participle having an Accusative Object are as follows (299 in all, 56 in the Introductions):—

1. *In the Nominative, Singular or Plural*
(239 in all, 26 in the "Introductions")

The Nominative of the Appositive Present Participle with an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* (in the singular, all genders, and in the plural, masculine and feminine); occasionally in *-ndo* (in the plural, masculine and, possibly, neuter [3]); rarely in *-nd* (in the singular, masculine), in *-ndæ* (in the singular, masculine), and in *-nda* (in the plural, masculine). See Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 527, 532, 534, and 538. The vowel preceding the above endings is usually *e,* but is occasionally *a* or *æ* or *o:* for details, see Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 529 ff.,

[3] See *L.* 15. 9 (*ða wif . . . cuoeðendo*); and compare Lindelöf[2], *l. c.,* p. 237, who tells us that, while *wif* is usually neuter, it is sometimes feminine.

and Kolbe, *l. c.*, §§ 207 ff. When no ending is given in the following statistics, *-nde* is to be understood.

beada, *order, command* (1): *J.* (1): I. 8.11[b].

bearna, *burn* (1): *J.* (1): 5.35[a].

bebeada, *order, command* (1): *Mat.* (1): 11.1 (or Predicative?).

behalda, *behold* (1): *Mk.* (1): 10.21 (*-nd*).

bera, *bear, carry* (3): *L.* (2): 5.18[a]: 22.10[b].—*J.* (1): 19.15.

bida, *await, expect* (1): *L.* (1): 2.25 (*-nd*).

bidda, *pray* (1): *Mk.* (1): 11.24.

bita (bidta), *bite* (1): *Mk.* (1): 1.26[a] (*bidtende*).

brenga, *bring* (1): *Mk.* (1): 2.3.

cærra: see *cerra.*

ceiga, *call* (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 1.8 (*-ndæ*).—*Mk.* (1): 3.31 (*-ndo*).

cerra (cærra), *turn, move* (2): *Mat.* (1): 27.39[b].—*Mk.* (1): 15.29[c].

cliop(p)iga, *cry out, exclaim* (4): *Mat.* (2): 9.27[a]; 11.16[b].—*L.* (2): 3.4; 4.41[a].

costiga, *tempt* (1): *Mk.* (1): 8.11[c] (*-ndo*).

cunniga, *tempt* (1): *Mat.* (1): 19.3[a].

cursiga, *plat* (1): *Mk.* (1): 15.17 (*-ndo*).

cuoeða, *say, declare* (155): *Mat.* (61): I. 5.1; I. 8.4; I. 16.14[b] (*-nd*); 2.2; 8.27, 29, 31; 9.14 (*-ndo*), 27[b], 33; 10.7, 12; 12.38; 13.3[a], 31; 14.26[b], 27, 33; 15.1 (*-ndo*), 7, 21, 23, 25; 17.5[b], 10[a]; 18.1, 26, 28; 19.3[b]; 20.12, 21 (*-ndo*), 30[b] (*-ndo*); 21.10, 20 (*-ndo*), 23[b], 25; 22.24; 24.3, 5; 25.9 (*-ndo*), 11 (*-ndo*), 44 (*-ndo*), 45; 26.8[b], 17[a], 27[b], 39[b], 42, 44[b], 48, 68; 27.11, 23, 29[b], 40, 41, 46, 54[b], 62; 28.13[a], 18[b].—*Mk.* (38): I. 5.9[a]; 1.7[a], 15, 24[a], 25, 27; 2.12; 3.11 (*-ndo*); 5.12 (*-ndo*), 23, 35[b]; 6.2, 35; 7.37; 8.15, 16, 26, 28, 33; 9.6, 11, 25, 38[a]; 10.26, 35, 49[b]; 11.9, 17, 31; 12.6, 18; 14.39[b], 44, 57 (*-ndo*), 60, 68; 15.29[d], 34.—*L.* (43): I. 4.5[b]; I. 7.9[a]; 1.66, 67; 3.10; 4.34[a], 41[b] (*-nda*); 5.12, 21[b]; 7.20; 8.8[b], 24, 54; 9.18, 35; 13.25[c] (*-ndo*), 31 (*-ndo*); 14.30[a] (*-ndo*); 15.2, 9 (*-ndo*); 17.4, 13 (*-ndo*); 18.13; 19.16, 38; 20.2 (*-ndo*), 5, 21 (*-ndo*), 27 (*-ndo*);

21.7[a] (*-ndo*), 8 (*-ndo*); 22.19, 64 (*-ndo*), 66 (*-ndo*); 23.2[b] (*-ndo*), 5 (*-ndo*), 18, 21 (*-ndo*), 35[b] (*-ndo*), 37 (*-ndo*); 24.23[a] (*-ndo*), 29 (*-ndo*); 27.7.—*J.* (13): I. 4.5 (*-ndo*); I. 7.9[a]; 1.15; 4.31 (*-ndo*), 51[b] (*-ndo*); 6, **52**[a] (*-ndo*); 11.3 (*-ndo*), 31 (*-ndo*); 12.21; 18.22, 40; 19.6 (*-ndo*), 12 (*-ndo*).

doa, *do, make* (2): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.2[a] (*-nd*).—*L.* (1): 17.16 (*-nd*).

doema, *judge* (2): *Mat.* (1): 19.28.—*L.* (1): 22.30.

eftwæcca, *resuscitate* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.9[c].

forbeada, *forbid, prohibit* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.11 (*-nd*).

forebeada, *forbid, prohibit* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.15[a] (*-nd*).

forleta, *dismiss* (3): *Mk.* (1): 26.44[a].—*Mk.* (2): 4.36; 14.50 (*-ndo*).

fraigna: see *fregna.*

fregna (fraigna), *enquire, ask* (2): *Mk.* (2): I. 4.8[a]; I. 5.4.

fulwiga, *baptize* (1): *Mat.* (1): 28.19.

gearwiga, *prepare* (2): *Mat.* (1): 27.28.—*L.* (1): I. 8.13[b].

gebidda, *pray* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.39[a].

gebloedsiga, *bless* (1): *L.* (1): 24.53[b].

gelæra, *teach* (1): *Mk.* (1): 7.7.

genim(m)a, *take, accept* (3): *Mat.* (3): 26.27[a], 37[a]; 27.6

genioma: see *genim(m)a.*

gesea, *see* (2): *Mat.* (2): 26.8[a]; 27.54[a].

geteara, *tear* (1): *Mk.* (1): 9.26.

habba, *have* (6): *Mat.* (2): 8.28; 26.7[a].—*Mk.* (3): I. 2.5[b]; 1.22; 8.18.—*J.* (1): 5.5.

halda, *hold* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.11 (*-nd*).

heriga, *praise* (1): *L.* (1): 2.20[b] (*-ndo*).

hrina, *touch* (2): *Mk.* (1): 1.41.—*L.* (1): I. 5.6[a] (*-ndo*).

hyhta, *hope* (1): *L.* (1): 6.35 (*-ndo*).

læra, *teach* (2): *Mat.* (2): 9.35; 28.20[a].

lofiga, *praise* (1): *L.* (1): 24.53[a] (*-ndo;* or Predicative?).

merciga, *seal* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.66.

nim(m)a (nioma), *take, hold* (4): *Mat.* (3): I. 10.3; 26.57; 27.27.—*J.* (1): 2.6.

nioma: see *nim(m)a.*

ondeta, *confess* (1): *Mk.* (1): 1.5.
onginna, *begin* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.10.
sella, *give up* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.4.
senda, *send* (2): *Mat.* (1): 27.35.—*L.* (1): I. 10.12.
setta, *set, place* (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.3[b].
sla, *strike* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.51.
soeca, *seek* (7): *Mat.* (3): 12.43, 46[b], 47.—*Mk.* (1): 8.11[b].—*L.* (1): 11.24.—*J.* (2): I. 5.5[a] (*-ndo*); 6.24 (*-ndo*).
spreca, *speak, say* (1): *Mat.* (1): 17.3.
witta (wuta), *know* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.10.
worpa, *throw away* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.5[a].
wuldriga, *glorify* (1): *L.* (1): 2.20[a] (*-ndo*).
wundriga, *wonder at, admire* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.8.
wyrca, *work, make* (1): *J.* (1): 5.18[b].

2. *In the Genitive, Singular or Plural*
(11 in all, 7 in the "Introductions")

The Genitive of the Appositive Present Participle with an Accusative Object ends normally in *-ndes* for the singular (masculine) and in *-ndra* for the plural (masculine); occasionally in *-nde* (in the singular, masculine and feminine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 536, and 541.

bidda, *pray* (2): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.6 (*-nde;* Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 527: gsm.).—*J.* (1): 5.3 (*-ndra*).
bodiga, *preach, command* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 22.2 (*-ndes*).
cliopiga, *cry out, exclaim* (1): *Mat.* (1): 3.3[b] (or nom.? *-nde;* Cook: gsm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 535: gsm.).
cuoeða, *say, declare* (2): *L.* (1): 2.13[b] (*-ndra*).—*J.* (1): I. 4.7 (*-ndes*).
heriga, *praise* (1): *L.* (1): 2.13[a] (*-ndra*).
nioma, *pluck* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.20 (*-ndra*).
sæcga, *say, declare* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.6[a] (*-nde*; Cook: pres. p.).
setta, *institute, set up* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.4[b] (*-ndes*).
wyrca, *work* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 14.9 (*-nde;* Cook: gsm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 536: gsm.).

3. *In the Dative-Instrumental, Singular or Plural* (22 in all, 14 in the "Introductions")

The Dative-Instrumental of the Appositive Present Participle with an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* (in the singular, the masculine regularly and the feminine occasionally) and in *-ndum* (in the plural, masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 532, and 542. When no ending is given below, *-ndum* is to be understood.

abida, *await, expect* (1) : *L.* (1) : 12.36.

æfterfylga, *follow* (1) : *L.* (1) : 7.9.

bidda, *ask, request* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 19.6[a].

cuoeða, *say, declare* (3) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 4.2[b] (*-nde*).—*L.* (1) : 7.32[c].—*J.* (1) : I. 5.7 (*-nde*).

fraigna, see *fregna.*

fregna (fraigna), *request* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 21.19.

gefraigna, *enquire* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 21.13 (*-nde*).

giwiga, *request, demand* (2) : *L.* (2) : I. 9.13 (*-nde*) ; 6.30 (*-nde*).

habba, *have* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 3.3 (*-nde*).

halda, *hold* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 7.7.

helpa, *help* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 7.1 (*-nde*).

licga, *throw, cast* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 4.6[b] (*licendum* = *iactantibus*).

lufiga, *love* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 7.6.

soeca, *seek* (3) : *Mat.* (1) : 13.45 (*-nde*).—*Mk.* (1) : I. 3.19[a].—*J.* (1) : I. 2.5[b].

timbra, *build* (2) : *L.* (2) : 6.48 (*-nde*) ; 6.49 (*-nde*).

wilniga, *desire* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 6.14[c].

witgiga, *prophesy* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 3.16[b] (*-nde*).

4. *In the Accusative, Singular or Plural* (27 in all, 9 in the "Introductions")

The Accusative of the Appositive Present Participle with an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* (in the singular, all genders, and in the plural, masculine) ; occasionally in *-nd* (in

the singular, masculine) and in *-ndo* (in the singular and in the plural, each masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l.c.*, §§ 527, 532, 535, and 538. When no ending is given below, *-nde* is to be understood.

cuoeða, *say, declare* (10): *Mat.* (9): 1.22; 2.15, 17; 3.3[a]; 8.17; 12.17; 13.35 (*cuoeðen* for *cuoeðende?* Cook: pres. p.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 533: it is for *cuoeðend*); 21.4 (*-ndo*); 27.9.—*Mk.* (1): I. 3.1[b].

doa, *do, make* (1): *L.* (1): 15.10 (*-nd*); Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 532: asm.).

giwiga, *demand, request* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.14[b].

habba, *have* (7): *Mat.* (2): 9.32 (*-nd*); 18.8.—*Mk.* (4): 1.32[a, b]; 9.17; 11.13.—*L.* (1): 15.7.—*J.* (1): I. 4.8.

læda, *lead* (1): *J.* (1): I. 3.6.

lufiga, *love* (1): *L.* (1): 6.32.

onsacca, *refuse* (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.8[b].

senda, *send, cast* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 5.6 (*senden* for *sendende?* Cook: pres. p., asf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 535: "*senden* asf. Mk. Pr. 5, 6, ist wahrscheinlich eine nicht ausgeschriebene form (vgl. § 466)").

unwita, *not to know* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 5.9 (*-ndo;* Cook: apm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 538: apm.).

wilniga, *desire, wish* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.12 (*-ndo;* Cook: ap*n.*, a typographical error for ap*m.?* Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 538: apm.).

witta: see *wuta.*

wuta (witta), *know* (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.18.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Irrespective of its case, the Appositive Present Participle with an Object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is due to the influence of the Latin original. (1) In all instances except eight, the Northumbrian appositive present participle with an object translates a Latin appositive present participle with an object. In these eight examples the Latin correspondents are as follows: a gerundive in the accusative (*Mat.* I. 18.9[c]), 1; a substantivized participle with an accusative object (*L.* 3.4, 6.32), 2;

an ablative absolute in the passive (*Mat.* 26.37[a], 44[a]; 27.5[a], 6, 54[a]), 5. Moreover, (2) in the majority of instances (in 555 out of 846 examples, or in the ratio of about 1.52 to 1, for the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as a whole), the Latin appositive present participle with an object is translated otherwise than by an appositive participle, usually by a co-ordinated [4] finite verb (about 508 times), occasionally by a subordinated finite verb (about 40 times), or in the ratio of 12.7 to 1.[5] The Northumbrian gloss, then, was more influenced by the Latin than was the West-Saxon translation of the *Gospels,* in which latter, as was stated earlier in this chapter, only 122 present appositive participles with an object occur; but, like the translator of the *West-Saxon Gospels,* the glossator normally adhered to the native English idiom of finite verb instead of participle. (3) The idiom in West-Saxon and probably in the Germanic languages as a whole was borrowed from the Latin. See *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 297-313, especially pp. 307-313.

APPENDIX IV

THE GOVERNING POWER OF THE APPOSITIVE PRESENT PARTICIPLE IN THE GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Although the thesis that, in Anglo-Saxon and in the Germanic languages as a whole, the Appositive Present Participle originally had not the Power of Governing an Accusative Object, but acquired this power from the Latin or (in the case of Gothic) from the Greek, first enunciated by me in *The Apposi-*

[4] The very large number of co-ordinated finite verbs is partly due, no doubt, to the frequency of the co-ordinate use of the present participle in the Latin original, but also to the glossator's lack of feeling for subordinate conceptions. Notice, for instance, his not infrequent translation of the Latin present participle that is equivalent to a dependent relative clause by a co-ordinated finite verb, as in *J.* 14.10: uorda ðа ic spreco iuh from me seolfum ne spreco ic se fæder uutudlice in mec *uunað* he *uel* ðe uyrcas ða uerca = uerba quæ ego loquor uobis a me ipse non loquor pater autem in me *manens* ipse facit opera.

[5] Of the remaining 7 examples in the Latin, the participle is thus rendered: by a noun in an oblique case, 1; by an adverb, 1; omitted, 5.

tive Participle in Anglo-Saxon, pp. 307-314, 339-341, and reaffirmed in the preceding discussion of the Present Participle having an object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* was generally accepted by the English grammarians that chanced to review that monograph, the fact that the thesis was questioned by so distinguished an Indo-Germanic grammarian as the late Professor Victor Henry, leads me to give here a few additional statements in support of this thesis. Professor Henry did me the honor to publish a most gracious review of my monograph on the Appositive Participle, in the *Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature,* of October 14, 1901, pp. 285-286. Were it not unfair to Professor Henry, I should quote only the sentences questioning the thesis above stated. I hope, therefore, that I shall be pardoned for quoting the review in its entirety. It runs:

"L'auteur appelle 'participe appositif,' présent ou passé, le type syntactique 'Taillefer allait chantant' ou 'Roland tomba percé de coups.' Ce type, à son tour, suivant des distinctions subtiles, mais ici nécessaires parce qu'elles servent de repères à une statistique minutieuse, se rencontre en triple fonction, avec une inégale fréquence, dans les langues germaniques: d'adjectif, lorsqu'il qualifie spécifiquement le substantif de la proposition; d'adverbe, si la modification porte sur le verbe; coordonnée, enfin, quand il tient lieu d'une autre proposition construite en parataxe. De la rareté de cette dernière fonction et de la plupart des emplois adverbiaux dans les plus anciens textes anglo-saxons, de la tendance marquée d'Alfred et autres auteurs à remplacer le participe appositif du texte latin qu'ils traduisent par une parataxe ou une hypotaxe ou quelque expédient équivalent, M. Callaway conclut que ces constructions, étrangères au vieux fonds germanique, ne se sont implantées que plus tard sous une influence monastique et littéraire, et que la fonction d'adjectif était primitivement à peu près la seule connue. Confirmée par le témoignage des langues-sœurs, puisque aujourd'hui encore l'allemand (p. 336) déploie dans l'usage des participes beaucoup moins de liberté et de souplesse que l'anglais, cette induction générale semble pleinement satisfaisante. Cer-

tains résultats accessoires provoquent, sinon la méfiance, du moins la surprise: par exemple, l'impuissance du participe appositif anglo-saxon à régir un complément (p. 351). Ce trait est absolument contradictoire à ce que nous savons de la syntaxe indo-européenne, où tout nom verbal était apte à gouverner un nom d'objet comme l'eût fait le verbe lui-même. Or, plus on avance dans l'histoire de la langue, plus le participe, simple nom à l'origine et entièrement distinct du verbe, s'incorpore à la conjugaison et en devient partie intégrante: partageant les attributs du verbe au début même, à plus forte raison les devrait-il conserver et développer alors qu'il est devenu, dans le concept du sujet parlant, un mode du verbe, et l'on ne s'explique pas la régression qui l'atteint à ce point du vue dans le domains du germanisme. Mais on y regardera à deux fois à partir d'un pur *a priori* pour discuter des données aussi solidement établies que celles de M. Callaway: il n'a pas dépouillé mois de dix-neuf ouvrages anglo-saxons, dont quelques uns fort volumineux, sans compter les originaux latins et les textes d'autres langues; il en a extrait tous les exemples de participes appositifs, les a classés dans ses catégories théoriques, et transcrits, pour ceux dont j'ai vérifié l'exactitude, avec une impeccable correction. Encore un travail qui fait heureusement augurer de la jeune et robuste philologie du Nouveau-Monde."

I shall not here repeat the arguments given for this thesis in *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon;* I shall strive merely to fortify the arguments there given and to bring the discussion up to date. At the time of publishing that monograph, in 1901, I had seen merely a summary of Professor Nygaard's " Den Lærde Stil i den Norrøne Prosa," published in the *Sproglig Historiske Studier Tilegnede Prof. C. R. Unger,* Kristiania, 1896, pp. 153-170, which summary I quoted from the Berlin *Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie* for 1896; and I had not even heard of the publication of Professor Nygaard's (for my purpose) far more important article, " Om Brugen af det Saakaldte Præsens Particip i Oldnorsk," in the *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyn-*

dighed og Historie, Kjøbenhavn, 1879, pp. 203-228. But I have recently secured these two articles, and they seem to me to show unmistakably that what I have claimed concerning the regimen of the present appositive participle in Anglo-Saxon, is equally true of that participle in Old Norse. In the second of the two articles mentioned, for example, Professor Nygaard declares that, in the earlier and more original Old Norse (which he designates by the adjective classical), the present appositive participle of transitive verbs is very rare in an active sense, and that, if a noun object is added, it is in the genitive case (p. 216): "I det klassiske sprog bruges præs. part. af transitive verber yderst sjelden med aktiv betydning, og føies der en styrelse til et saadant, staar denne i genitiv." On the other hand, he tells us, on p. 213, that, in translations from and in imitations of a foreign language (Latin), the present participle of transitive verbs occurs frequently in the appositive use, in an active sense, and that in this use the participle has full verbal power, and can govern an accusative object precisely as if it were a finite verb. The passage runs: "Præs. part. af transitive verber forekommer hyppig i oversatte skrifter og, hvor fremmed sprogbrug efterlignes, navnlig som apposition og prædikatsord.

"I apposition sættes det i alm. til sætningens subjekt. Det har da i regelen betydning af en tidssætning, nu og da betegner det dog nærmest aarsagen og med tilføiet *sva sem* kan det ogsaa repræsentere en (hypothetisk) sammenligningssætning. Participiet har her fuldstændig verbal Karakter og forbindes ligesom et finit verbum med objekt, hensynsbetegnelse, en fjernere gjenstand i genitiv, en infinitiv eller en objektssætning. Hovedverbet udtrykker fordetmeste udsagn, bevægelse eller ankomst." He gives among other examples these:—*Gisl. Pr.* 210.14; hann sendi ða orð Antonio sva *segjandi* etc.; *Str.* 18.8: skundaði heim *berandi* barnit; *Str.* 69.10; þakkaði henni mörgum þökkum *kyssandi* hana ok *halsfaðmandi.*

In his recent *Norrøn Syntax* (Kristiania, 1906), Professor Nygaard reaffirms his statement as to the original genitive regi-

men of the present participle in old Norse, and ascribes to Latin influence the acquisition by the present participle of the power to govern an accusative object. In § 242 he says: "Det oprindelige forhold med hensyn til præs. part. synes altsaa at have været: . . . præs. part. er i det væsentlige at betragte som adjektiver; de har ingen fremtrædende tidsbetydning og har nominal styrelse (genitiv).

"Saaledes vedbliver ogsaa idethele sprogbrugen at være i F. S.[6]

"I L. S.[6] udvides og modificeres brugen ved paavirkning af fremmede analogier, navnlig det latinske nutidsparticip og passive verbaladjektiv.

"Det aktive part. dannes her ogsaa af transitive verber og faar verbal karakter (med tydelig tidsbetydning og verbal styrelse)."

Moreover, in another section (233), Professor Nygaard tells us that, in the popular style, as a rule, the appositive present participle of the transitive verb is not used, but instead is used a subordinated finite verb or a co-ordinated finite verb.

A more complete parallel to the situation with reference to the governing power of the participle in Anglo-Saxon could scarcely have been drawn by Professor Nygaard, even if he had had open before him my treatise on *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*. His statements are the more remarkable when we learn that he had not seen that monograph.

In his *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg, 1913 (a revision of the late Bernhard Kahle's work with the same title), Professor Andreas Heusler gives a treatment of the Present Participle in the Scandinavian languages, which, though brief and couched in general terms, seems to favor the thesis set forth by me (§ 422):—

"Seine Verwendung in der volkstümlichen Prosa ist beschränkt: es wird fast nur von intransitiven Verba gebildet; abgesehen von festen Verbindungen (wie *farande konor* 'her-

[6] F. S. = Folkelig Stil, 'popular style'; L. S. = Lærd Stil, 'learned style.'

umziehende Weiber,' *dugande maþr* 'wackrer Mann,' *sitiande hlutr* 'sitzender Anteil = Zuschauerrolle') erscheint es meist nur appositiv in Verbindungen wie: *kom þar riþande Hialte* 'kam da H. geritten': *hon gekk þegiande at Flosa* 'sie trat schweigend zu Flose.'

"Ein Hauptkennzeichen des 'gelehrten Stiles' sind die den Bericht weiterführenden und transitiven, auch die prädikativen Partt. wie: *frændr hans komo, eggiande hann at fa ser eignarspuso* 'seine Verwandten kamen, ihn antreibend, sich ein Ehegespons zu nehmen': *konungs son var fyrstr ok fremstr allra sinna manna. . . . eige fyrr lettande, en hann er þar komande, sem bardagenn var, þegar sino suerþe bregþande ok huern um annan hǫgguande ok suma meþ spiote leggiande* 'der Königssohn war der erste und vorderste aller seiner Mannen . . . nicht eher ablassend, als bis er dahin kommend ist, wo die Schlacht war, alsbald sein Schwert ziehend und einen nach dem andern hauend und etliche mit dem Spiese durchbohrend.'"

As to Old High German, justification for the statements made by me in 1901 concerning the regimen of the appositive present participle therein, is to be found in Dr. Konrad Meyer's *Zur Syntax des Participium Praesentis im Althochdeutschen*, a Marburg dissertation published in 1906. On page 21 Dr. Meyer tells us that, of the present appositive participles in their Latin originals, the *Monsee-Wiener Fragmente* avoids 5/7; Isidor, 2/3; and even Tatian, 1/5; that, when the present appositive participle is found in these Old High German texts, it translates almost without exception a Latin appositive participle [7]; and that, when the participle of the Latin original is not kept, in the majority of instances it is rendered in Old High German either by a coördinated finite verb (in *Monsee-Wiener Fragmente* and in Tatian chiefly) or by a subordinated finite verb [8] (in Isidor chiefly). On p. 40 he states that the appositive present participle is relatively rare in the more original Otfrid,

[7] See Meyer, *l. c.*, pp. 22, 25, and 32.
[8] See Meyer, *l. c.*, pp. 23, 26, and 34.

only about 44 examples occurring in the whole of his works. Of these 44 examples of the appositive present participle, I may add, not a few are modal; many (about 33) occur after verbs of motion; and in some [9] of these 33 examples, the participle seems to me predicative rather than appositive, and is independently so classed by Dr. Karl Rick in his *Das Prädikative Participium Praesentis im Althochdeutschen,* a Bonn dissertation of 1905. In a word, then, there are even fewer appositive present participles in Otfrid than is stated by Dr. Meyer.

But, what is more to my present purpose, Dr. Meyer segregates the present appositive participles having an accusative object from those not having such an object, and gives the following totals therefor: [10]—Isidor: 0 to 8; Otfrid: 12 to 44; Monsee-Wiener Fragments: 7 to 20; and Tatian: 131 to 466. Of 140 Latin present appositive participles rendered by a present appositive participle by Notker, 83 participles have an accusative object in the Old High German, according to Meyer, pp. 51-54. Meyer tells us, too, that, in about 212 instances, Notker uses an appositive present participle without having had a participle in his Latin original, but unfortunately he does not here segregate participles having an object from those not having an object, though he does say that in the majority of these 212 instances the participle has the adverbial form in *-ndo;* many of these, therefore, probably do not [10a] have an object. In Otfrid the present appositive participle having an accusative object is less frequent than indicated by Dr. Meyer, who, as above stated, gives twelve examples,[11] for ten of these twelve

[9] For example, in II, 13.1 (*fuar druhtin bredigonti*) and III, 2.25 (unz er *fuar ahtonti* thes selben wortes mahti), both of which are considered predicative by Dr. Rick, *l. c.*, p. 30, though appositive by Dr. Meyer.

[10] These statistics take account only of present participles modifying the subject nominative.

[10a] Since writing this statement, I have myself looked up eighty of these examples, taken at randon, and of the eighty examples only fourteen have an accusative object. As we should expect, most of the participles that do not have an object are used adverbially, and denote manner.

[11] The twelve examples are found as follows: I, 4.20, 5.50^{b}, 13.18, 23.10; III, 2.25, 8.13^{b}, 10.13^{a}; IV 30.1; V, 4.15, 9.5, 9.7^{a}, 14.10.

participles are considered predicative by Dr. Rick, and in most instances he is justified in his classification, I think, the participles being predicate nominatives after intransitive verbs of motion (*faran* and *gangan*); though in one of these ten examples (I, 4.20: *Ingiang* er tho skioro, goldo garo ziaro, mit zinseru in henti thaz *hus rouhenti*) the participle is so far removed from the principal verb that it seems appositive to me rather than predicative. This leaves us at most only three present appositive participles with an accusative object in Otfrid (I, 4.20, just quoted: I, 5.50[b]: Noh keisor untar manne, nimo geba *bringe* fuazfallonti int *inan erenti;* and I, 13.18: Thiu muater *barg* mit festi thiu uuort in iru brusti, in herzen mit githahti *thiz* ebono *ahtonti*). These three appositive participles may very easily have been suggested by any one of the numerous Latin sources [12] that have been suggested for Otfrid's *Evangelienbuch*. To me the wonder is, not that Otfrid thrice uses the appositive participle with an accusative object, but that he uses it only thrice.

As to Tatian and Notker, the frequency of the appositive present participle without an object is due, I think, largely to the influence of their Latin originals, but, also, in the case of Notker, partly to his fondness for the native Germanic idiom of the participle to denote manner, in which latter case, Notker more commonly uses, Meyer tells us (pp. 48-49), the adverbial form of the present participle in *-ndo*. With both Tatian and Notker, the frequency of the appositive present participle with an accusative object is due almost wholly to the influence of their Latin originals, I think. For the frequency of the appositive present participle (whether with or without an object) in the added passages of Notker, Dr. Meyer, *l. c.*, p. 50, offers another explanation, not, however, incompatible with my own: "Im Gegensatz zu Is., Mons., Tat. führt also Notker sehr zahlreiche deutsche Part. Praes. in seinen Text ein, denen im Lateinischen kein Part. entspricht. Das würde er schwerlich

[12] For a summary statement concerning these sources, see A. L. Plumhoff's *Beiträge zu den Quellen Otfrids*, Kiel Dis., 1898.

getan haben, wenn er, wie jene Uebersetzer, deutsche Sätze in ununterbrochener Reihenfolge aneinander gefügt hätte, ohne latein. Sätze einzuschieben. Vielmehr sind die vielen Participien bedingt durch den eigentümlichen abrupten Charakter von Notkers Mischprosa, die sich in ihrem Streben nach Prägnanz der Sprechweise dem gemächlich fortschreitenden deutschen Satzbau, wie er in zusammenhängender Rede herrscht, nicht anzupassen vermag." See, too, Dr. Paul Hoffmann's *Die Mischprosa Notkers des Deutschen* (= *Palaestra,* No. LVIII), Berlin, 1910; and Dr. Hans Naumann's *Notkers Boethius: Untersuchungen ueber Quellen und Stil* (= *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker,* No. CXXI), Strassburg, 1913. On p. 79, in a passage quoted by me on p. 24 above, Professor Naumann calls attention to the Latinized style of Notker, especially in the use of the participle and the infinitive. I have made little use of Dr. Wilhelm Göcking's *Das Participium bei Notker,* a Strassburg dissertation of 1905, because for my present purpose Notker's use of the participle is better treated by Dr. Meyer, who, as already stated, segregates the participles having an object from those not having an object. Although Dr. Göcking does not do this, he does classify his participles according to the idea denoted into Temporal, Causal, etc. A combination of the plan of Dr. Meyer with that of Dr. Göcking would give the best results, it seems to me.

As in the case of Old Norse, so in Old High German the situation with reference to the appositive present participle with an accusative object very closely parallels that in Anglo-Saxon. Perhaps I should add that, although Dr. Meyer several times speaks of the Latin influence upon Old High German syntax, he does not specifically discuss the origin of the appositive use of the present participle (whether with or without an object) in Old High German; that apparently neither he nor Dr. Göcking had seen *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon;* and that, while gratefully availing myself, in the present study,

of the statistics given by these two scholars, the interpretation thereof is my own.

As to Middle High German, valuable testimony is given by Dr. Theodor Matthias, in his "Zur Geschichte der Deutschen Mittelwortfügungen," an article that appeared in the *Zeitschrift für den Deutschen Unterricht* of 1897 (Vol. XI, pp. 681-708), but that was not known to me in 1900, when I wrote *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon*. After telling us, on p. 689, that the appositive preterite participle is common in Middle High German, Dr. Matthias declares, on p. 690, that the appositive present participle is rare, especially when having an object. Says he: "Viel seltener ist im Mhd. dieser Gebrauch des 1. Mittelwortes, und unzweifelhaft hat fremdes, namentlich lateinisches Vorbild darauf geführt. . . . Vor allem von der Beschwerung dieses 1. Mittelwortes mit Ergänzungen und Umständen lässt sich deutlich nachweisen, wie sie aus lateinischen Vorlagen entsprang."

II. WITHOUT AN OBJECT

The Present Appositive Participle without an Accusative Object occurs about 108 times (168 including the "Introductions") in the Northumbrian Gloss to 115 times in the *West-Saxon Gospels*.

The following examples are typical:—*Mat.* 28.18[a]: *geneolecende* ðe hælend spreccend wæs to him = *accedens* iesus locutus est eis; *Mat.* I. 19.16[a]: *geongende uel* geeade ofer sae ðone peter ðruncnende ahefes = *Ambulans* supra mare petrum mergentem leuat; *Mat.* 20.30[a]: heonu tuoege blindo *sittende* æt weg geherdon = ecce duo caeci *sedentes* secus uiam audierunt.

The statistics in full of the Appositive Present Participle not having an Accusative Object are as follows (167 in all, 59 in the "Introductions"):—

1. *In the Nominative, Singular or Plural*

(88 in all, 14 in the " Introductions," including the examples in Notes 1 and 2)

The Nominative of the Appositive Present Participle without an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* (in the singular, all genders, and in the plural, masculine); occasionally in *-nd* (in the singular, masculine, and in the plural, masculine); rarely in *-ndo* (in the plural, masculine) and in *-ing* (in the singular, neuter (?)). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 532, 534, and 538. When no ending is given below, *-nde* is to be understood.

adunestiga, *descend* (1): *Mk.* (1): 15.30.

basniga, *expect* (1): *L.* (1): 23.35[a] (or Predicative?).

bodiga, *preach* (1): *L.* (1) 9.6[a].

cerra, *turn* (1): *L.* (1): 8.37.

cliop(p)iga, *cry out, exclaim* (2): *Mk.* (2): 5.7; 15.39.

cuma (cyma), *come* (3): *Mat.* (1): 20.10 (*cymende*).—*Mk.* (2): 7.1 (*cymende*); 16.1 (*cymmende*).

cunniga, *tempt* (1): *Mat.* (1): 16.1 (*-ndo*).

cuaciga, *tremble* (1): *L.* (1): 8.47.

cyma: see *cuma.*

doa, *do, act* (1): *L.* (1): 16.8 (*-nd*).

ebolsiga, *blaspheme* (2): *Mk.* (1): 15.29[b].—*L.* (1): 22.65.

efsta, *hasten* (1): *L.* (1): 2.16.

falla, *fall* (1): *L.* (1): 4.7.

fara, *go, pass by* (7): *Mk.* (4): 1.16[a], 35 (*-nd*); 13.1; 16.20[a].—*L.* (3): I. 4.1[b]; 1.6 (*-ndo*); 4.30.

foera, *depart* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.7[a].

fore(h)luta, *bend down, stoop* (1): *Mk.* (1): 1.7[b].

foreliora, *pass by* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.39[a] (*foreliornende* (*sic*) in Skeat and in Cook; but is a scribal or typographical error for *foreliorende,* the form given in the Rushworth text? Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 527, has *foreliornende* without comment).

fulwiga, *baptize* (1): *J.* (1): 1.31[a].

gebidda, *pray* (1): *L.* (1): 21.36[a].

geecniga, *conceive* (1) : *L.* (1) : 1.31.
gefeaga, *rejoice* (3) : *L.* (3) : 15.5; 19.6, 37[a].
gehera, *hear* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 27.47[b].
geneoleca, *approach* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 28.18[a].
geonga, *go, walk* (7) : *Mat.* (3) : I. 19.16[a]; 26.49; 27.5[b].—*Mk.* (2) : 6.48[b]; 14.39[a].—*L.* (1) : 24.17.—*J.* (1) : I. 4.16.
gesea, *see* (2) : *Mat.* (2) : 13.13, 14.
habba, *have* (1) : *L.* (1) : 7.2 (*-nd*).
hera, *hear* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 4.12 (*-nd*).
hlifiga: see *lifiga.*
hrema, *weep* (2) : *Mat.* (1) : 2.18[b].—*J.* (1) : 20.11.
hwispriga, *murmur* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 4.20.
ingeonga, *enter* (1) : *L.* (1) : 8.16.
iorna, *run* (2) : *Mat.* (2) : 27.48[a]; 28.8[a].
læra, *teach* (3) : *Mk.* (1) : 12.35 (*-nd*).—*L.* (2) : 5.17[a]; 13.22.
lecniga, *cure, heal* (1) : *L.* (1) : 9.6[b].
lifiga (hlifiga), *live* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 27.63.
lixiga, *shine* (1) : *J.* (1) : 5.35[b].
mæna, *mourn* (1) : *L.* (1) : 2.48.
ofcliop(p)iga, *cry out, exclaim* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 1.26[b].
ondswariga, *answer, respond* (1) : *L.* (1) : 13.25[d].
scimiga, *shine, coruscate* (1) : *L.* (1) : 17.24.
seofiga, *lament* (1) : *Mk.* 10.22.
sitta, *sit* (4) : *Mat.* (1) : 20.30[a].—*Mk.* (1) : I. 4.16.—*L.* (1) : 14.28[a].—*J.* (1) : 12.15.
slepa, *sleep* (2) : *Mat.* (1) : *L.* 18.4[b].—*L.* (1) : I. 5.18.
spatiga, *spit* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 27.30.
spreca, *speak* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 8.7 (*-nd*).
stiga, *descend* (1) : *J.* (1) : 6.50.
stonda, *stand* (5) : *Mat.* (2) : 6.5[a]; 27.47[a].—*J.* (3) : 11.56; 18.18, 25.
tela, *mock* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 15.31.
ðerhwæc(c)a, *watch* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 5.5.
woepa, *weep* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 2.18[a].
wuniga, *remain* (1) : *J.* (1) : 14.25.

NOTES

1. *Participles Wavering between the Appositive and the Predicative Uses* are found in the following after the verb *cuma,* 'come' (7):

drinca, *drink* (2): *Mat.* (2): 11.18[b], 19[b] (*dringende*).

eatta, *eat* (2): *Mat.* (2): 11.18[a], 19[a].

geonga, *walk* (2): *Mat.* (1): 14.25.—*Mk.* (1): I. 3.14.

sitta, *sit* (1): *Mat.* (1): 21.5.

2. *An Appositive Present Participle in -Ing* is found in *L.* 8.8[a]: oðer feoll on eorðo god & *uphebbing* dyde wæstm hunteantig siða monigfald = aliud cecidit in terram bonam et *ortum* fecit fructum centumplum (Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: & worhte hundfealdne wæstm). Professor Cook classifies *uphebbing* as a noun in the nominative, singular, neuter. Dr. Carpenter, also, *l. c.,* § 335, considers *uphebbing* a noun in the nominative singular, but does not assign it gender. Professor Lindelöf, in his "Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Altnorthumbrischen," p. 260, holds that *uphebbing* is a noun in the accusative singular, but says nothing as to its gender. In the only other passage in which *uphebbing* is found in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* (*L.* I. 10.11), it is a noun; and it is possible, of course, that in *L.* 8.8[a] the glossator thoughtlessly mistook *ortum* for the noun instead of the participle, and intended *uphebbing* to be considered a noun. But, as the interpretation of *uphebbing* as a noun gives no sense in the present passage, whereas the interpretation thereof as a participle makes perfect sense, it seems better to me to consider *uphebbing* a participle here (in the nominative, singular, neuter), one of the earliest examples of the present participle ending in *-ing.* Compare Note 3 below.

3. *A Verbal Noun in -Ung (-Ing), or the Gerund, Governing an Accusative Object* is found in the Rushworth *Luke* 23.48: & al ðe here hiora ðaðe ætsceowunga togedre comun *to sceawunga* ðæt & gisegun ðaðe aworden werun slænde on breost hiora eftcerdun = Et omnis turba eorum qui simul aderant *ad specta(cu)lum* istud et uidebant quæ fiebant percutientes pectora sua reuertebantur (Lindisfarne: & all ðæt here ðara

ðaðe adgeædre tocuomon *uel* toweron *to sceawanne* ðæt & gesegon ðaðe woeron aworden slægendo woeron hiora breosto eftcerrdon; W. S.: & eall wered ðe *æt* ðisse *wæfersynne* wæron & gesawon ða ðing ðe gewurdon wæron agen gewende hyra breost beoton). It is barely possible that *sceawunga* is accusative neuter here, and that *ðæt* is its modifier instead of its object; but Professor Lindelöf, *l. c.*, p. 265, takes *sceawunga* to be in the dative singular feminine, and declares that, in the *Rushworth Gospels,* only two examples (in *Mk.* 5.38 and *L.* 13.6) of nouns in *-ung* having an accusative in *-a* are found, and in these two instances the nouns are preceded by the feminine article, *ða.* On the other hand, on p. 242, he tells us that once in the *Rushworth Gospels* (*L.* 20.47: *ðæt mara uel mast cursunge*) a noun in *-ung* is of the neuter gender. Neither *uphebbing* nor *sceawunga* is referred to by Professor G. O. Curme, by Professor Eugen Einenkel, or by Mr. C. T. Onions in their recent articles [13] dealing with the origin of the English Gerund. As an example of the gerund governing an accusative object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* Professor Curme [14] cites *Luke* 7.45: ne blann *cossetunges foeta* mine = non cessauit *osculari pedes* meos (Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: ne geswac ðæt heo mine fet ne cyste). But, with Professor Einenkel,[15] I consider *foeta* a genitive, not an accusa-

[13] The articles by Professor Curme are "History of the English Gerund," in *Englische Studien,* Vol. XLV, 1912, pp. 349-380; "The Gerund in Old English and German," in *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 491-498; and "The English Gerund Again," in *Englische Studien,* Vol. XLIX, 1916, p. 323;—by Professor Einenkel: "Zur Geschichte des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVII, 1913, pp. 382-392; "Die Entwickelung des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 1-76; "Nachträge zum Gerundium," in *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1914, p. 212; and "Zur Herkunft des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 499-504;—by Mr. Onions: "The History of the English Gerund," in *Englische Studien,* Vol. XLVIII, 1914, pp. 169-171.—Professor Einenkel has given a concise but comprehensive treatment of the English Gerund in his recent *Historische Syntax,* 3rd ed., Strassburg, 1916, pp. 6-14. Another recent discussion of the Gerund is given by Dr. H. Willert, in his "Vom Substantivischen Infinitiv," in *Englische Studien,* XLVIII, 1914-1915, pp. 246-250.

[14] In *Englische Studien,* Vol. XLV, 1912, p. 352.

[15] In *Anglia,* Vol. XXXVII, 1913, p. 386.

tive. In his "The Gerund in Old English and German," p. 496, Professor Curme declares, "In looking over the preceding pages it ought to become clear that there was a lively feeling for the gerund in Old English. The characteristic forms are already firmly establisht. Middle English gradually brought about a change in the word-order and modern English is differentiating more closely the use of the genitive and accusative. We see in the entire history of the English Gerund only the natural display of pure English forces and cannot discover any foreign forces that have permanently affected English at this point." To this denial of any foreign influence upon the English gerund, Professor Einenkel rightly replies, in his "Zur Herkunft des Englischen Gerundiums," p. 499: "Dass in interlinearübersetzungen und übertragungen ähnlicher art gerundien vorkommen, ist bekannt; ich habe selbst deren mehrere nachgewiesen. Es ist aber deutlich erkennbar, dass sie sämtlich ganz sklavische und mechanische nachbildungen von lateinischen gerundien sind und ebensowenig beweisen können, dass sie zu dem eigentlichen körper ihrer sprache gehören, wie die genau entsprechenden nachbildungen lateinischer gerundien in althochdeutschen schriften ähnlicher art." The correctness of this view as to the gerund in Old English seems to me evidenced by three facts: (1) that very few gerunds with true verbal power (*i. e.*, of gerunds governing an accusative object) have as yet been pointed out in Old English literature; (2) that, in every one of the instances so far cited, the idiom occurs only in translations from the Latin, and that in almost every one the influence of the Latin (usually a gerund, occasionally an infinitive or a prepositional phrase) is at once evident; and (3) that, as the present appositive participle in Old English did not originally have the power to govern an accusative object, but gradually borrowed it from the Latin, it is but natural to suppose that the noun in *-ing* (*-ung*), which had, and, indeed, still has, less of verbal power than the present participle, originally had not the power of governing an accusative object, and that, in Old English, it, likewise, acquired this power from the Latin.

The first two points have, of course, been strongly urged by Professor Einenkel. The third point, I think, has not been made hitherto; and will appear all the stronger, I believe, when it is recalled that, most probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole, the present appositive participle originally had not the power of governing an accusative object, but likewise borrowed this power from the classical languages, usually the Latin. But, again with Professor Einenkel, I do not think that the gerund with accusative regimen ever became naturalized in Old English, certainly not nearly to the extent that the prseent appositive participle with accusative regimen did.—See Note 4 to Section II of Chapter III, also Note 4 of Section XIII of that chapter.

2. *In the Genitive, Singular or Plural*
(10 in all, 4 in the "Introductions")

The Genitive of the Appositive Present Participle without an Accusative Object ends normally in *-ndes* in the singular (masculine and neuter) and in *-ndra* in the plural (masculine); occasionally in *-nde* (in the singular, masculine); rarely in *-ndo* (in the singular, masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 536, and 541.

ceiga, *call* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.4[a] (*-ndes*).

cliop(p)iga, *cry out, exclaim* (1): *L.* (1): 18.7 (*-ndra*).

fara, *go* (1): *L.* (1): 9.53 (*-ndes*).

foeda, *feed* (1): *L.* (1): 8.32[a] (*-ndra*).

hlioniga (linga), *recline* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.7[b] (*lingendes*).

iorna, *run* (1): *L.* (1): 22.44 (*-ndes*).

linga: see *hlioniga.*

rariga, *roar* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 7.12 (*-nde;* Cook: gsm.).

tocuma (tocyma), *come* (2): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.8[a] (*-nde;* Cook: gsm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 536: gsm.).—*L.* (1): I. 2.9 (*-ndo;* Cook: npm. Possibly the glossator mistook *uenturi,* which is here in the genitive, singular, masculine, for the nominative, plural, masculine. Carpenter does not cite this example).

3. *In the Dative-Instrumental, Singular or Plural* (36 in all, 23 in the "Introductions")

The Dative-Instrumental of the Appositive Present Participle without an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* in the singular (all genders) and in *-ndum* in the plural (masculine); rarely in *-nd* (in the singular, masculine) and in *-nde* (in the plural, masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 532, and 542. When no ending is given below, *-ndum* is to be understood.

bidda, *pray* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.20^{b} (*-nde;* Cook: dsf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 537: dsf.).

cunniga, *tempt* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 5.2.

dwoela, *wander* (1): *Mat.* I. 20.12 (*-nde*).

eatta, *eat* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.21.

eftcerra, *return* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.15.

eftfara, *return* (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.6^{b} (*-nde*).

fara, *go* (2): *Mk.* (1): 16.12^{b} (*-nde*).—*L.* (1): I. 5.11^{b}.

foeda, *feed* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.7 (*-nde*).

frasiga, *enquire* (2): *J.* (2): I. 3.4; I. 6.6.

fulwiga, *baptize* (1): *J.* (1): I. 4.1^{a} (*-nde*).

fylga, *follow* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.13^{a} (*-nde*).

gefeaga, *rejoice* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.16.

gelefa, *believe* (1): *Mk.* (1): 9.42.

geonga, *go* (2): *Mk.* (1): 16.12^{a}.—*L.* (1): I. 11.10.

habba, *have* (1): *L.* (1): 19.25 (*-nde*).

(h)eriga, *plow* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.6^{b} (*-nde*).

hliniga: see *hlioniga.*

hlioniga (hliniga), *recline* (1): *Mk.* (1): 16.14.

hræwiga, *repent* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.4^{b} (*-nde*).

mæna, *mourn* (1): *Mk.* (1): 16.10^{a}.

ondspurniga (-spyrniga), *offend* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.4^{a} (*ondspyrnende*).

ondspyrniga: see *ondspurniga.*

sitta, *sit* (3): *Mat.* (1): 11.16^{a}.—*L.* (2): I. 5.12; 7.32^{a}.

soeca, *seek* (3): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.8^{a}.—*L.* (1): I. 4.5^{a} (*-nde,* or gsf. ?).—*J.* (1): I. 7.15.

somniga, *congregate* (1): *Mat.* (1): 13.47[b] (*-nde*).
spreca, *speak* (1): *L.* (1): 7.32[b].
stonda, *stand* (1): *Mat.* (1): 24.15 (*-nde*).
ðreatiga, *rebuke* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.3.
wita (wuta), *know* (1): *J.* (1): I. 2.5[a] (*-nd*).
woepa (wopa), *weep* (1): *Mk.* (1): 16.10[b].
worðiga, *honor, adore* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 22.10.

4. *In the Accusative, Singular or Plural*
(33 in all, 17 in the "Introductions")

The Accusative of the Appositive Present Participle without an Accusative Object ends normally in *-nde* (in the singular, all genders, and in the plural, masculine); rarely in *-nda* (in the singular and the plural, each masculine), in *-ndo* (in the plural, masculine), and in *-nd* (in the singular, masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 527, 532, 535, and 538. When no ending is given below, *-nde* is to be understood. The vowel preceding these endings is usually *e*, but is occasionally *a*.

bera, *bear, conceive* (1): *L.* (1): 2.5[b].
bigeonga, *pass by* (1): *Mk.* (1): 15.21[a].
bloedsiga, *bless* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.16[b].
brenga, *bring* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.16[a].
cuma (cymma), *come* (4): *Mat.* (1): 3.16[b].—*Mk.* (1): 15.21[b].—*L.* (1): 23.26[a].—*J.* (1): 1.9.
cymma: see *cuma.*
eatta, *eat* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.15.
eftdraga, *pull back, kick* (1): *L.* (1): I. 3.6 (*-end*).
embehtiga, *minister* (1): *J.* (1): I. 6.16[a].
eriga, *plow* (1): *L.* (1): 17.7[a].
etta: see *eatta.*
fæma, *foam* (1): *Mk.* (1): 9.20.
flowa, *flow* (1): *L.* (1): 6.38[b].
foeda, *feed* (1): *L.* (1): 17.7.
frohtiga, *frighten, become afraid* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 2.10[a].
fulwiga, *baptize* (1): *J.* (1): I. 3.7.
gefeaga, *rejoice* (1): *J.* (1): I. 5.11.

gefraigna, *enquire* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 18.4[a] (*-nda*).
hongiga, *hang* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 11.8[a].
læra, *teach* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 21.33[a].
licga, *lie, recline* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 9.2 (*liccende*).
mishabba, *to be unwell* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 8.16.
ondeta, *confess* (3) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 2.10[b] (*-nda*).—*L.* (2) : I. 4.15; I. 11.8[b].
smeaga, *think* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 7.10[b].
soeca, *seek* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 4.10 (*-nda;* Cook: apm.).
styriga, *stir, move* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 11.7[c].
ðruncniga (druncniga), *sink* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 19.16[b].
unsceortiga, *not to be deficient* (1) : *L.* (1) : 12.33.
unwitta, *be ignorant, not to know* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 7.19[a] (Cook: nsm., but surely this must be a misprint? Dr. Carpenter, however, *l. c.,* § 534, seems to consider *unwittende* nominative, singular, masculine, also).
woepa, *weep* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 5.6[b] (*-ndo;* Cook: apm.).

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Whatever its case, the Appositive Present Participle without an Accusative Object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is usually [16] due to the influence of the Latin original. (1) In all except seven instances, the Northumbrian present appositive participle without an object corresponds to the same idiom in Latin. The Latin correspondents in the seven exceptional cases are an appositive adjective (*Mat.* I. 20.12), 1; a gerundive (*Mat.* I. 20.16[b]; *L.* I. 10.3), 2; a subjunctive (*Mk.* 13.1; *L.* 16.8), 2; a noun (*Mk.* I. 1.4[a]), 1; and a finite verb that is in proximity to an appositive participle (*L.* 8.37), 1. Again, (2) in the majority of instances (in 454 out of 615 examples, or in the ratio of about 1.34 to 1 for the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as a whole), the Latin appositive present participle without an object is rendered otherwise than by an appositive participle, usually

[16] The exceptional instances in which the appositive use of the present participle may be a native English idiom are indicated in the section (D) dealing with "The Origin of the Appositive Participle as a whole."

by a co-ordinated finite verb (about 406 times), occasionally by a subordinated finite verb (45 times), or in the ratio of 9 to 1.[17] Again the Northumbrian gloss is slightly more influenced by the Latin than was the West-Saxon translation, in which latter only 108 examples of the present appositive participle without an object are found; but again the Northumbrian gloss remains true to the native English idiom of finite verb instead of participle. (3) In all but a few of its uses, the appositive present participle without an object in West-Saxon and probably in the Germanic languages as a whole was borrowed from the Latin. See *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 297-307 and 339-341.

B. The Preterite Participle
(92 in all, 42 in the "Introductions")

I. with an object
(3 in all, 1 in the "Introductions")

Of the Preterite Appositive Participle with an Accusative Object, I have found but three examples in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as follows:—

(ge)trymma, *give* (1): *J.* (1): 4.39: fore word ðæs uifes *cyðnise getrymmedes* = propter uerbum mulieris *testimonium perhibentis.* [Cook: *getrymmedes,* pp., gs.—I think, however, that *getrymmedes* is probably a scribal error for *getrymmendes.* Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 553: *getrymmedes,* gsm.]

(ge)wæcca, *awake, arouse* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.10ª: ðæt wif of herning blodes hæleð *geweht* & ðæt *mæden* = mulierem a profluuis sanguinis sanat *suscitans* et *puellam.*

offylga, *follow* (1): *L.* (1): 1.3: gesegen wæs æc me *offylgde* from fruma *alle* georne = uisum est et mihi *assecuto* a principio *omnia* diligenter. [Rushworth: gisegen wæs & me *offyligde* from fruma alra georne; W. S., Professor Bright's

[17] Of the remaining three examples in the Latin, the appositive present participle is rendered once each by an adjective and by a noun in an oblique case; and is omitted once.

1906 text: me geðuhte, geornlice eallum [*fram fruman gefylgdum*] *on* endebyrdnesse writan ðe. Skeat's text omits the bracketed words, and has *oð* instead of *on*.—Professor Cook considers *offylgde* an indicative preterite, 3rd sg., which is a possible interpretation, but it seems to me that more probably *offylgde* is a dative-instrumental of the past participle, and is active in sense here owing to the fact that it translates a Latin deponent verb. Carpenter does not cite *offylgde* as a participle.]

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Clearly in each of the three examples the fact that the Northumbrian passive participle governs an accusative object, is due to the influence of the Latin original. In the whole of West-Saxon only one example was found of this idiom, and it likewise was due to Latin influence. See *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 314.

II. WITHOUT AN OBJECT

(89 in all, 41 in the " Introductions ")

Of the Preterite Participle without an Accusative Object, 48 examples (89 including the " Introductions ") occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to 42 in the *West-Saxon Gospels.*

The following will serve as illustrations:—*Mat.* 21.29: æfter ðon uutedlice mið hreawnisse *gecerred* geeade = postea autem paenitentia *motus* abiit; *Mat.* 7.6: *gewoende uel gecerdo* toslitas iuh = *conuersi* disrumpant uos; *Mk.* 16.8: soð ða ilco ðona *foerdo* flugon = At illae *exeuntes* fugerunt de monumento.

The statistics in full of the Preterite Appositive Participle without an Accusative Object are as follows (89 in all, 41 in the " Introductions "):—

1. *In the Nominative, Singular or Plural*

(35 in all, 16 in the " Introductions ")

The Nominative of the Appositive Preterite Participle without an Object ends normally in *-ed* (*-ad*) (once in *-et*) or *-en* in

the singular (all genders) and in *-de* in the plural (masculine); occasionally in *-do* (in the singular, feminine(?), and in the plural, masculine), in *-no* (in the singular, masculine, and in the plural, masculine), in *-d* (in the plural, masculine and neuter(?)), and in *-t* (in the singular, masculine). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 544, 549, 550, 551, 553, and 554. When no ending is given below, *-ed* (*-d, -t*) or *-en* is to be understood according to whether the verb is weak or strong.

asenda, *send* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.47 (*-de*).

beswica, *deceive* (1): *L.* (1): I. 2.11 (*-no*).

efnegesetta, *constitute, place* (2): *L.* (1): 7.8 (*efnegesettet*).—*J.* (1): 5.13 (*-do;* Cook: nsf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 553: nsf.).

foera, *go* (1): *Mk.* (1): 16.8 (*-do*).

foregelæra, *instruct in advance* (1): *Mat.* (1): 14.8.

(ge)bera, *bear* (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 6.10; I. 14.11^{b}.

(ge)binda, *bind* (1): *J.* (1): 11.44^{a} (*-no*).

(ge)bloedsiga, *bless* (1): *Mat.* (1): 25.34 (*-ad*).

(ge)bringa, *bring, lift up* (1): *L.* (1): I. 5.11^{a}.

(ge)cerra, *turn* (4): *Mat.* (2): I. 2.5; 21.29.—*Mk.* (1): I. 1.2^{b}.—*L.* (1): 7.13.

(ge)cunniga, *tempt* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 21.12.

(ge)endiga, *saturate* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 7.4^{b} (= *saturatus*).

(ge)gearwiga, *clothe, gird* (1): *Mk.* (1): 14.51 (*-ad*).

(ge)fylla, *complete* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 19.2.

(ge)læra, *teach* (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 1.6; I. 8.13.

(ge)nemna, *name* (1): *J.* (1): 3.1.

(ge)sceoga, *shoe* (1): *Mk.* (1): 6.9 (*gescoed;* Cook: apm., but is it not nominative? Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 554, does not differentiate between nominative and accusative here).

(ge)sella, *give up, hand down* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.14^{c} (npm.? Cook: pp.).

(ge)setta, *place* (1): *Mat.* (1): 5.14^{b}.

(ge)sigefæstniga, *crown* (1): *J.* (1): I. 8.12 (*-ad;* or Predicative?).

(ge)unrotsiga, *sadden* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.22^{a} (*-de*).

gewoefa, *weave* (1): *J.* (1): 19.23.
gewoenda, *turn* (1): *Mat.* (1): 7.6 (*-de*).
(ge)worðа, *become, be made* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 14.11ª.
(ge)wroega, *accuse* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.12.
oferlæda, *translate* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 2.15ª.
todæla, *divide* (2): *Mat.* (1): 12.25.—*L.* (1): 11.17.
ðerhwrita, *write, inscribe* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 4.2.

2. *In the Genitive, Singular or Plural*
(7 in all, 6 in the "Introductions")

The Genitive of the Appositive Preterite Participle without an Accusative Object ends occasionally, in the singular, in *-des* (masculine), in *-ed* (masculine and feminine), in *-en* (masculine), in *-na* (masculine(?)), and in *-ne* (masculine). The plural is not recorded in this use. Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 549 and 553.

begeatta (bi-), *find* (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 19.12ª (*-na;* Cook: gsf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 549, Anmk.: "In Mt. Pr. 19.12 (*meregrotta*) *bigetna* (= *margaritæ repertæ*) lässt sich die schwache endung der postposition oder der attraktion von *-a* in *meregrotta* zuschreiben"). As *bigetna* modifies *meregrotta,* and as Professor Cook gives only the masculine gender for the latter, I consider that the participle, also, is masculine.—*L.* (1): I. 8.16 (*-ne;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 549: gsf.).

bigeatta: see *begeatta.*

foretreda, *destroy* (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.3ª (*-en;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

(ge)breda, *broil* (1): *L.* (1): 24.42 (*-des*).

(ge)cenna, *beget* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 15.1 (*-ed;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

gefylla, *complete* (1): *L.* (1): I. 2.15 (*-ed;* Cook: not cited).

gesla, *slay* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 19.14ª (*-en;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

3. *In the Dative-Instrumental, Singular or Plural*
(8 in all, 3 in the "Introductions")

The Dative-Instrumental of the Appositive Preterite Participle without an Accusative Object ends occasionally, in the singular, in *-de* (feminine and neuter), in *-ed* (masculine and feminine), and in *-en* (masculine and feminine-neuter (*heawun* for *heawen*)); in the plural in *-dum* (feminine-neuter). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 549, 552, 553, and 556.

aheawa, *cut off* (1): *L.* (1): 23.53 (*aheawun;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

forcuma, *overcome* (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.6[a] (*forcummen;* Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited).

(ge)timbra, *build* (1): *L.* (1): I. 5.9 (*getimberde*). [Cook makes *getimberde* ind. pret., 3rd sg., but is it not a past participle in the dative-instrumental? Carpenter does not cite *getimberde* as a participle.]

(ge)woeddiga, *espouse* (1): *L.* (1): 1.27 (*-ed;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

oferhiwiga, *transfigure* (1): *Mat.* (1): 23.27 (*-dum*).

oferswiða, *overcome* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 16.8[a] (*oferswided;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

senda, *send* (1): *Mat.* (1): 13.47[a] (*sende;* Cook: form not entered as pp.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 553: dsf.).

togedegla, *hide* (1): *Mat.* (1): 13.44 (*-de;* Cook: pp., dsn.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 553: dsn.).

4. *In the Accusative, Singular or Plural*
(39 in all, 16 in the "Introductions")

The Accusative of the Appositive Preterite Participle without an Accusative Object ends, in the singular, occasionally in *-ed* (*-ad,* once each *-od* and *-eð*) (masculine and neuter), in *-en* (once *-an*) (masculine and neuter), in *-edo* (neuter(?)), in *-eno* (masculine (or plural?) and feminine), in *-ne* (masculine), in *-e* (neuter or feminine), in *-t* (feminine and neuter); in the plural, in *-ed* (*-ad*) (masculine and neuter(?)), in *-e* for *-en*

(neuter(?)), in *-eda* (masculine), in *-ede* (masculine), in *-edo* (feminine or feminine-neuter), in *-ena* (masculine), and in *-t* (neuter(?)). Compare Carpenter, *l. c.*, §§ 544, 549, 550, 551, 553, and 554.

aworð**a**, *become, be made* (1): *L.* (1): 23.19 (*-no;* Cook: asf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 549, anm. 2: "In L. 23.19, *fe'setnung . . . awordeno = propter seditionem . . . facta* (*sic*) ist vielleicht nsf. oder npn. gemeint").

awyrca, *make* (2): *Mk.* (2): 14.58^{b} (*aworht*), 58^{c} (*aworht*).

befæstiga, *espouse* (1): *L.* (1): 2.5^{a} (*-ad*).

begeata, *find* (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 20.9^{a} (*-en*); 4.24 (*-na;* Cook: apm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 551: apm.).

begrioppa, *catch* (1): *J.* (1): (1): I. 5.8^{b} (*-e;* Cook: asf.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 549: asf.). But the participle modifies *ðæt uif.* Concerning the double gender of *wif* (neuter and feminine), see Lindelöf [2], p. 237.

beswinga, *flagellate* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.26 (*-ene;* Cook: asm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 553: asm.).

efnegebringa, *heap up* (1): *L.* (1): 6.83^{a} (*efnegebroht*).

efnegeworða, *bring together* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 8.15 (*-ena;* Cook: apm.; Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 551: apm.).

eftforleta, *leave* (1): *J.* (1): I. 7.17 (*-no;* Cook: npm., but should be apm.? Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 551: nom.-ac. p. m.).

foregegearwiga, *prepare, offer* (1): *L.* (1): 6.4^{a} (*-ad*).

forleta, *leave, dismiss* (1): *L.* (1): I. 4.20 (*-en*).

(ge)binda, *bind* (2): *Mat.* (1): 27.2 (*-ene;* Cook: asm.)—*J.* (1): 18.24 (*-en*).

(ge)boeta, *emend* (1): *L.* (1): 23.16 (*-ad*).

gebringa, *bring* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.20^{a} (*gebroht*).

gecerra, *move, shake* (1): *L.* (1): 7.24^{c} (*-ed*).

(ge)clæða, *clothe* (1): *Mk.* (1): 5.15^{b} (*gecladed*).

(ge)doema, *condemn* (1): *J.* (1): I. 5.9 (*-edo;* Cook: asf., but the participle modifies *ðæt wif;* Carpenter, *l. c.*, § 553: wk. as., but he assigns no gender).

(ge)friga, *free, liberate* (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 8.9 (*gefreod*).

(ge)gearwiga, *clothe* (2): *L.* (2): 7.25^{b} (*-ad*); 23.11 (*-ad*).

(ge)hera, *hear* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 6.12^{b} (*-ed*).

(ge)hiwiga, *clothe in purple* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.2 (*-dne;* Cook: asm.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 553: asm.).

gemenga, *mix* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.34^{b} (*gemenceð;* Cook: *gemenged,* pp.).

(ge)nemna, *name* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 2.12 (*-edo;* Cook: apm.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 555: apm.). [But *genemnedo* modifies *boec,* and, according to Professor Cook, *boc* is either f. or n. I take *genemnedo* to be feminine here. If *genemnedo* is masculine here, it is due to the too close following of the Latin, *nuncupatos.*]

(ge)scrynca (gescrinca), *shrink, dry up* (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.4 (*-an;* Cook: pp.; Carpenter: not cited).

(ge)sea, *see* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 6.12^{c} (*gesege* (*sic*); Cook: pp.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 547, Amk. 1: "Der verlust des *n* in *gesege,* Mt. Pr. 6.12, wird schreib-fehler und nicht lautgesetzlich sein").

(ge)temesiga, *sift* (?) (1): *Mat.* (1): 12.4 (*-eda;* Cook: apm.; Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 555: apm.).

(ge)ðersca, *kill* (1) : *L.* (1) : 20.10 (*geðorscen*).

(ge)woeda, *clothe* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 11.8 (*-ed*).

(ge)worða, *become, be made* (2) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 1.6^{c} (*-en*).—*J.* (1) : 2.9 (*-en*).

(ge)wyrca, *make* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 5.5 (*geworht*).

ofnioma, *take, catch* (1) : *J.* (1) : 8.3 (*-en*).

senda, *send* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 21.8 (*sende;* Cook: not cited; Carpenter: not cited).

unwoeda, *not to clothe* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : 22.11 (*-ed*).

ymbgearwiga, *clothe* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : 16.5^{b} (*-ad*).

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

In most instances,[18] the Preterite Appositive Participle without an Accusative Object was probably a native idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* (1) Except in eight cases, it is true, the Lindisfarne Preterite Appositive Participle without an object corresponds to the same idiom in the Latin original. In the exceptional examples the Latin correspondents are as follows: a noun in the ablative (*Mat.* I. 6.10, *J.* 3.1), 2; a gerundive (one predicative: *J.* I. 8.12; one appositive: *L.* I. 5.9), 2; a noun in the genitive (*Mat.* 12.4, *L.* 6.4ª), 2; a passive subjunctive (*Mat.* 27.12), 1; a passive infinitive with accusative subject (*L.* 7.24ᶜ), 1. But in the majority of instances (in 81 out of 133 examples, or in the ratio of 1.64 to 1), the absolute participle of the Latin original is retained by the Northumbrian glossator. (2) In most of its uses, the idiom was native to West-Saxon and probably to the Germanic languages as a whole. See *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 297 ff., especially pp. 299-300.

On page 79 I give a synoptic table showing the occurrences of the Appositive Participle, in the several cases, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.*

C. Uses of the Appositive Participle

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in West-Saxon, the Appositive Participle has three chief uses:—

I. The Adjectival, in which the Appositive Participle is equivalent to a Dependent Adjectival (Relative) Clause, and denotes either an action or a state, as in *Mat.* 26.7ª: cuom to him wif *hæbbende* stænna fulle smirinisse = accessit ad eum mulier *habens* alabastrum ungenti; *L.* 5.18ª: heono wæras *berende* on bed *uel* on ber mono = ecce uiri *portantes* in lecto

[18] The details are given below in the section specifically dealing with "the Origin of the Appositive Participle."

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE APPOSITIVE PARTICIPLE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

GOSPELS	Present Participle								Preterite Participle								Total of Present Participle		Total of Preterite Participle		Total of Present and of Preterite Participles	
	Nom.		Gen.		Dat.		Acc.		Nom.		Gen.		Dat.		Acc.							
	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.	With Obj.	Without Obj.
Matthew: Total	94	26	4	2	4	8	11	9	..	20	..	3	..	4	1	14	113	45	1	41	114	86
Gospel	88	24	1	1	1	4	11	5	..	9	..	..	..	3	..	7	101	34	..	19	101	53
Introd'n	6	2	3	1	3	4	..	4	..	11	..	3	..	1	1	7	12	11	1	22	13	33
Mark: Total	64	21	3	2	4	7	8	7	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	5	79	37	..	9	79	46
Gospel	54	18	..	..	1	6	4	3	..	3	..	..	..	..	..	4	59	27	..	7	59	34
Introd'n	10	3	3	2	3	1	4	4	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	20	10	..	2	20	12
Luke: Total	60	30	2	6	9	15	6	13	..	6	..	4	1	4	..	14	77	64	1	28	78	92
Gospel	54	23	2	5	6	3	3	7	..	3	..	1	1	2	..	9	65	38	1	15	66	53
Introd'n	6	7	..	1	3	12	3	6	..	3	..	3	..	2	..	5	12	26	..	13	12	39
John: Total	21	11	2	..	5	6	2	4	..	5	1	..	..	..	..	6	30	21	1	11	31	32
Gospel	17	9	1	..	..	..	..	1	..	4	1	..	..	..	..	3	18	10	1	7	19	17
Introd'n	4	2	1	..	5	6	2	3	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	3	12	11	..	4	12	15
Totals.....	239	88	11	10	22	36	27	33	..	35	1	7	1	8	1	39	299	167	3	89	302	256
Gospels	213	74	4	6	8	13	18	16	..	19	1	1	1	5	..	23	243	109	2	48	245	157
Introd'ns	26	14	7	4	14	23	9	17	..	16	..	6	..	3	1	16	56	58	1	41	57	99

hominem; *Mat.* 12.25: hus *todæled uel tosliten* wiþ him ne stondas = domus *diuisa* contra se non stabit. At times, however, the Latin appositive participle that is equivalent to an adjectival (relative) clause, is awkwardly translated by a co-ordinate definite verb, as in *Mat.* 8.16: gebrohton him menigo diobles *hæfdon* = optulerunt ei multos dæmonia *habentes* (Rushworth: monige deofulseoke *hæbbende;* W. S.: manege deofolseoce).

II. Adverbial, in which the Appositive Participle is equivalent to a Dependent Adverbial (Conjunctive) Clause, and denotes time, manner, means, etc., as in *Mat.* 26.10: ða *wittende uel* wiste uutedlice ðe hælend cueð = *sciens* autem iesus ait; *Mat.* 27.4: ic synngade *uel* ic firinade *sellende uel* ic salde blod ðone soðfæst = peccaui *tradens* sanguinem iustum; *Mat.* 27.54ª: *gesende* eorð hroernise . . . ondreardon suiðe = *uiso* terræ *motu* . . . timuerunt ualde; *Mat.* 27.35: todældon hrægla his tan *sendende* = diuiserunt uestimenta eius sortem *mittentes.*

III. Co-ordinate, in which the Appositive Partciple is substantially equivalent to an Independent Clause, and either (1) denotes an accompanying circumstance (the "circumstantial" participle), or (2) repeats the idea of the principal verb (the "iterating" participle), as in *Mat.* 28.19: gaað forðon lærað alle cynno *uel* hædno *fulwuande* hia in noma fadores = euntes ergo docete omnes gentes *baptizantes* eos in nomine patris; *Mat.* 8.29: geceigdon ðus *cueðende* = clamauerunt *dicentes; Mat.* 25.9: geonduordon hogo *cuoeðendo* = responderunt prudentes *dicentes.*

The relative frequency of these three uses of the appositive participle is as follows: of the Adjectival, 249 examples occur, of which 168 are present participles; of the Adverbial, 78, of which 68 are present participles; and of the Co-ordinate, 231, of which 230 are present participles. In all, 558 appositive participles occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* of which 466 are present and 92 are preterite. For the *West-Saxon Gospels* the figures are as follows: of the Adjectival Use, 61 examples occur,

of which 44 are present participles; of the Adverbial, 81, of which 69 are present participles; and of the Co-ordinate, 132, of which 124 are present participles; a total of 274 appositive participles, of which 237 are present participles. The larger number of appositive participles in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as compared with the *West-Saxon Gospels* seems due to two facts: the former has extended prefaces not found in the latter; and the Northumbrian glossator adhered more closely to his Latin original than did the West-Saxon translator. Of the 558 appositive participles in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* 156 occur in the "Introductions," and 402 in the Gospels proper, as against 274 in the *West-Saxon Gospels.*

The three chief groups of the Appositive Participle—Adjectival, Adverbial, and Co-ordinate—call for only brief individual comment.

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* the Adjectival Use of the Appositive Participle occurs more frequently with the present than with the preterite participle, there being 168 of the former to 81 of the latter in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and 44 of the former to 17 of the latter in the *West-Saxon Gospels.* In West-Saxon as a whole, however, the preterite participle is much more frequent than the present in the Adjectival Use, there being 846 of the former to 377 of the latter.

The Adjectival Appositive Present Participle is found oftener without an object than with one in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* and in West-Saxon as a whole, the figures being respectively 94 to 74, 24 to 20, and 270 to 107.

Of the Appositive Preterite Participle in the Adjectival Use, 81 examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* 3 with an accusative object; 17, in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* none with an accusative object; and 846 in West-Saxon as a whole, none with an accusative object.

In all except thirteen instances, the Lindisfarne Adjectival

Appositive Participle translates the same idiom of the Latin original. Of these thirteen examples, two have a present participle with an accusative object translating a Latin substantivized appositive participle with an accusative object: *L.* 3.4 and *L.* 6.32; five have a present participle without an accusative object, corresponding to a Latin appositive adjective (*Mat.* I. 20.12), a Latin gerundive (*Mat.* I. 20.16[b], *L.* I. 10.3), a Latin subjunctive (*L.* 16.18), and a Latin noun in the genitive (descriptive) (Mk. I. 1.4[a]); and seven have a preterite participle without an accusative object, corresponding to a Latin gerundive (*J.* I. 8.12, *L.* I. 5.9(?)), a Latin noun in the genitive (descriptive) (*Mat.* 12.4, *L.* 6.4[a]), a Latin noun in the ablative (descriptive) (*Mat.* I. 6.10, *J.* 3.1), and a Latin passive infinitive with an accusative subject (*L.* 7.24[c]). These divergences from the Latin original are slight, and are such as are to be expected. It seems, therefore, that the evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* tends to confirm the conclusion reached as to the origin of the Adjectival Appositive Participle in West-Saxon, as stated in my monograph on *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 298-300; namely, that the adjectival use of the present appositive participle except with a few slightly verbal participles like *living, lying* (*licgende*), etc., was in West-Saxon due chiefly to Latin influence, especially if the participle governed an accusative object; but that the adjectival use of the preterite appositive participle was a native West-Saxon idiom.

Of the Adverbial Use of the Appositive Participle about 78 examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* of which 68 are present; against 81 in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* of which 69 are present.

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* an accusative object is found 28 times with the present participle to 27 in the *West-Saxon Gospels.* With the preterite participle an accusative object is not found in the former, and only once in the latter, in imitation of the Latin original.

In its adverbial use the appositive participle denotes subordinate relations of manner and means (combined here under the head of modal), of time, of cause, of purpose, of concession, and of condition. Some of the adverbial appositive participles admit of a twofold classification. According to my estimate, the approximate number of each use is: Modal, 23; Temporal, 32; Causal, 5; Final, 11; Concessive, 6; Conditional, 1. For the *West-Saxon Gospels,* the corresponding figures are: Modal, 15; Temporal, 32; Causal, 11; Final, 11; Concessive, 10; and Conditional, 2.

Of the Appositive participle denoting Time and Manner (including Means), examples have been given above in defining the groups. Here I need add only examples of the remaining adverbial uses.

Of the appositive participle denoting Cause, I cite all the clearer examples observed (5):—*Mat.* 26.8[a]: gesegon *uel* ðæt ða *geseende* . . . discipulas . . . wraðe weron = *uidentes* autem discipuli indignati sunt; *Mat.* 27.54[a]: *geseende* eorð hroernise . . . ondreardon suiðe = *uiso* terrae *motu* . . . timuerunt ualde; *L.* I. 8.13[b]: seteð geddung of ðæm laðendum seðe hine forcuoede *gearuande uel* geteldon = Ponit parabolam de inuitatis qui se excusare *studentes* (or Adjectival?); *Mat.* I. 8.13: *gelaered* sum oðer alexandrinesca mið micile bigeong & ec hogahscipe enne *uel* an us fore feower godspellum offorleort = *ammonius* (for *ammonitus?*) quidam alexandrinus magno studio atque industria unum nobis pro quattuor euangeliis dereliquit (or Adjectival ?); *L.* 7.13: se drihten mið miltheortnise *gecerred* ofer hia cuoeð = dominus misericordia *motus* super ea dixit (or Co-ordinate?).

Of the appositive participle denoting Purpose, eleven examples have been observed:—*Mat.* 16.1: togeneolecdon to him ða aldo . . . *cunnendo* & bedon hine = accesserunt ad eum pharisaei et sadducaei *temtantes* et rogauerunt eum (or Co-ordinate?); *Mat.* 19.3[a]: geneolecdon to him—[= blank] *cunnende* hine = accesserunt ad eum pharisaei *temtantes* eum; *Mat.* 19.28: sittes & gie ofer seatla tuelf *doemende* tuoelf strynda

israeles = sedebitis et uos super sedes duodecim *iudicantes* duodecim tribus israhel; *Mat.* 12.43: miđ đy . . . gaast . . . gaađ *uel* geeade đerh stowa dryia gesohte *uel soecende* rest = cum autem . . . spiritus . . . ambulat per loca arida *quaerens* requiem (or Co-ordinate?); *Mat.* 12.46: moder his & brođero stondas *uel* gestodon bedon *uel* sohton *uel soecende* spreca him = mater eius et fratres stabant foris *quaerentes* loqui ei (or Co-ordinate?); *Mat.* 12.47; moder đin & brođro đin ute stondes sohton *uel soecende* đec = mater tua et fratres tui foris stant *quaerentes* te (or Co-ordinate?); *Mk.* 8.11$^{b, c}$: ongunnon efnegesoeca miđ hine đæt hia sohton *uel soecende* from him becon of heofne *costendo* hine = coeperunt conquirere cum eo *quaerentes* ab illo signum dae (*sic* for *de?*) caelo *temtantes* eum; *L.* 11.24: đerheode *uel* gađ đerh stowa wæterleasa *soecende uel* sohte ræst = perambulat per loca inaquosa *quaerens* requiem; *J.* 6.24. cuomon to đær byrig sohton *uel soecende* đone hælend = uenerunt capharnaum *quaerentes* iesum; *J.* 1.31^{a}: cuom ic in uætre *fulguande uel* to fulguanne = ueni in aqua *baptizans.*

Of the appositive participle denoting Concession, six examples have been found:—*Mk.* 8.18: ego habbađ gie *uel hæbbende* ne geseađ gie = oculos *habentes* non uidetis; *J.* I. 5.5^{a}: *soecende* hine to gegrioppanne ne maehtun = *quaerentes* eum adprehendere nequeunt; *Mat.* 13.13: forđon *gesegende uel seende uel* đæt geseas *uel* gesegon ne seađ & đa geherdon ne heras hia = quia *uidentes* non uident et audientes non audient (or Co-ordinate?); *Mat.* 13.14: *gesegende* ge sciolon gesea *uel* ge geseas = *uidentes* uidebitis (?); *Mk.* 4.12: đætte gesegon geseađ & ne geseađ & đa *herend* geherađ & ne oncnaweđ = ut uidentes uideant et non uideant et *audientes* audiant et non intelligent; *L.* I. 3.6: đone long wiđ priclom *eftdrægend* drihten gecease = quem diu contra stimulos *recalcitrantem* dominus *elegisset.*

Of the appositive participle denoting Condition, only the following example has been found:—*Mat.* 18.8^{b}: god *uel* betra đe is to life ingae unhal *uel* halt đon tua honda *uel* tuoege foet *hæbbende uel* hæbbe sende in fyr ece = bonum tibi est ad uitam ingredi debilem uel clodum quam duas manus uel duos pedes *habentem* mitti [in] ignem aeternum.

In all cases except eight the Lindisfarne Adverbial Appositive Participle corresponds to a Latin appositive participle of the original. In these eight examples, seven participles denote time, and one denotes cause. Six of the participles are present, have an accusative object, and correspond to the following Latin idioms: a gerundive in the accusative (*Mat.* I. 18.9^{c}), 1; and an ablative absolute in the passive (*Mat.* 26.37^{a}, 44^{a}; 27.5^{a}, 6, 54), 5. Another of the participles is present, has no accusative object, and corresponds to a Latin subjunctive (*Mk.* 13.1). And one of the participles (in *Mat.* 27.12) is preterite, has no object, and corresponds to a Latin subjunctive passive. The evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* therefore, tends to confirm the conclusions reached on the basis of the West-Saxon as to the origin in West-Saxon of the adverbial appositive participle, as stated in detail in *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 300-306; namely, that the appositive participle (present and past) denoting manner was probably a native West-Saxon idiom; but that the appositive participle denoting other adverbial relations was in West-Saxon due mainly to Latin influence.

The Co-ordinate Appositive Participle, in both its circumstantial and its iterative uses, was illustrated above in defining the term co-ordinate. Here I should add that, as in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* so in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the co-ordinate use is very frequent, especially in its iterating species: about 155 examples occur of *cuoeðende* used co-ordinately.

In all instances except one (*L.* 8.37), the Co-ordinate Appositive Participle corresponds to the same idiom in the Latin original. In this one instance the Lindisfarne appositive participle translates a Latin finite verb that is in close proximity to a Latin appositive participle. I believe, therefore, that the *Lindisfarne Gospels* again tends to uphold the conclusion reached as to the origin of this idiom in West-Saxon; namely, that it was imported into West-Saxon directly from the Latin, chiefly from the Vulgate *New Testament.*

NOTES

1. *The Voice of the Appositive Participle.*—As a rule, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the Present Participle is active in sense. Occasionally, however, the Present Participle is probably passive in sense, as in the following passages, in which the Northumbrian present participle translates a Latin gerundive or preterite[19] participle:—*Mat.* I. 20.16[a, b]: foregeheht *brengende* him *bloedsende* lytla ne wiðsaca = Praecepit *oblatos* sibi *benedicendos* paruulos non repelli; *ib.* I. 18.9: geeade & *eftwæccende* dohter ðæs aldormonnes ðæt wif of herning blodes hæleð geweht & ðæt maeden = Pergens et *resuscitandam* filiam principis mulierem a profluuio sanguinis sanat suscitans et puellam. At times, too, the Substantival Present Participle is passive in sense, as in *L.* I. 8.13: seteð geddung of ðæm *laðendum* seðe hine forcuoede gearuande *uel* geteledon symbel ne woeron wyrðe = Ponit parabolam de *inuitatis* qui se excusare studentes cena non fuerint digni.—The Preterite Participle of intransitive verbs has an active sense, as in *Mat.* 7.6: *gewoendo uel gecerdo* toslitas iuh = *conuersi* disrumpant uos. Of transitive verbs, the Preterite Participle is usually passive in sense, but occasionally it is active in sense, as is possibly true of *geweht* = *suscitans* in *Mat.* I. 18.10, quoted in the earlier part of this note under *Mat.* I. 18.9; and of *offylgde* = *assecuto* in *L.* 1.3, quoted on p. 71 above. But in *J.* 4.39 (*getrymmedes* = *perhibentis*), also quoted on p. 71, *getrymmedes* is probably a scribal error for *getrymmendes.*—Concerning the voice of the appositive participle in West-Saxon, see *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 289-290. For the voice of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* see Note 1, on p. 5 above; and of the Predicative Participle, see the section on the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction below.

[19] Often, however, a Northumbrian appositive present participle, though translating a Latin passive participle (either absolute or appositive), remains active in sense by merely making the subject of the Latin participle the object in the translation, as in *Mat.* 26.44[a]: *forletende hia* eftersona eode = *relictis illis* iterum abiit.

2. *Some Possible Examples of the Appositive Participle* are mentioned in Note 1, p. 5; Note 3, p. 6; and Note 1, p. 10.

3. *An Alternative Choice between an Appositive Participle and a Finite Verb, as the Translation of a Latin Appositive Participle,* is not infrequently given by the Lindisfarne glossator, as in *Mat.* 26.49: sona *cwom uel geneolecde uel geongende* to ðam hælende cueð = confestim *accedens* ad iesum dixit; *ib.* 9.14: ða geneolecdon *uel* comon to him ðegnas iohannes *cueðendo uel* hia *cuedon* = accesserunt ad eum discipuli iohannis *dicentes;* etc., etc.

4. *Supplementary Particles with the Appositive Participle.*—In his "Conjunction Plus Participle Group in English," a Master of Arts dissertation presented at the University of North Carolina and published in *Studies in Philology,* IV, 1910, pp. 1-29, Mr. O. P. Rhyne discusses the earliest occurrences of the Supplementary Particle with the Appositive Participle. On p. 8, he declares: "Einenkel . . . traces it [the construction in question] . . . no further back than the middle of the 18th century. Indeed, it seems to be the impression of all grammarians who have treated the subject that the construction first came into English about this time. But in reality, it goes much farther back. I have been able to trace it as far back as 1552" (in *Roister Doister*). The earliest occurrence, however, antedates Mr. Rhyne's year (1552) by centuries. Although Mr. Rhyne quotes from Mätzner's *Englische Grammatik,* III, pp. 73-74, what is said concerning this construction, he seems to have overlooked page 90 of the same volume, where one example is given of this construction in Anglo-Saxon, and *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 290-291, where about a dozen examples are given from West-Saxon. I do not recall any example of the idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.*

I close this section with a Synoptic Table showing, approximately, the distribution of the several Uses of the Appositive Participle in the four *Lindisfarne Gospels.* As to the classification of individual examples, of course, there is room for difference of opinion.

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE USES OF THE APPOSITIVE PARTICIPLE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

Gospels	Adjectival		Adverbial												Co-ord.		Adverbial		Adjectival		Total With Object	Total No Object	Grand Total
			Modal		Temporal		Causal		Final		Concessive		Conditional										
	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.	With Obj.	No Obj.			
Matthew:																							
Pres.	20	26	3	7	4	3	2	..	5	1	..	2	1	..	78	6	15	13	20	26	113	45	158
Pret.	1	34	..	..	..	5	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	6	1	34	1	41	42
Mark:																							
Pres.	18	18	..	2	3	7	..	..	2	..	1	1	..	..	55	9	6	10	18	18	79	37	116
Pret.	..	8	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	8	..	9	9
Luke:																							
Pres.	24	36	1	8	1	4	1	..	1	..	..	1	..	..	49	15	4	13	24	36	77	64	141
Pret.	1	25	..	1	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	1	25	1	28	29
John:																							
Pres.	12	14	1	..	..	3	..	..	1	1	1	..	..	..	15	3	3	4	12	14	30	21	51
Pret.	1	11	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	11	1	11	12
Total Pres.	74	94	5	17	8	17	3	..	9	2	2	4	1	..	197	33	28	40	74	94	299	167	466
Total Pret.	3	78	..	1	..	7	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	10	3	78	3	89	92

D. Origin of the Idioms with the Appositive Participle: Summary Statement

The Origin of the Idioms with the Appositive Participle has, for the sake of brevity, been discussed in connection with the exposition of its several uses. See the preceding section, especially p. 81, for the Adjectival Use; p. 85, for the Adverbial Use; and p. 85, for the Co-ordinate Use. The results there obtained may be summarized here as follows. In the Adjectival Use, the Appositive Present Participle, except with a few slightly verbal participles, is due to Latin influence, especially if the participle governs an accusative object; while the Appositive Preterite Participle is a native English idiom, except when governing an accusative object. In the Adverbial Use, the Appositive Participle (present and past) denoting manner is probably a native English idiom; but in all other adverbial uses the Appositive Participle is probably due to the influence of the Latin. And in the Co-ordinate Use, whether circumstantial or iterative, the Appositive Participle is an importation from the Latin. That, in the uses above specified, the Latin influence is preponderating is evidenced by the fact that, in the alleged foreign uses, the appositive participle corresponds, almost without exception, to the same idiom in the Latin original; and that, in the majority of instances (in the ratio of 1.3 to 1 in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as a whole), the Northumbrian glossator renders the Latin appositive participle otherwise than by a participial phrase, usually by a co-ordinated [20] finite verb, less frequently by a subordinated finite verb. By this preference for finite verb over participial phrase, the *Lindisfarne* glossator again adopts the native English and the native Germanic idiom.

---

[20] For the ratio of co-ordinated to subordinated finite verbs, see pp. 52 and 71 above.

CHAPTER III

THE INFINITIVE

Introduction

In considering the syntax of the Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* I follow the general plan of treatment given to the West-Saxon Infinitive in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon.*

As in West-Saxon, so in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* from the standpoint of Form, there are two infinitives: (1) the uninflected, or simple, infinitive in *-a* [1] or in *-e* (occasionally in *-æ* or in *-i*), which corresponds to the West-Saxon uninflected infinitive in *-an,* and which in origin is the petrified and weathered nominative-accusative case of a neuter verbal noun; and (2) the uninflected, or gerundial, or prepositional, infinitive, made up of the preposition *to* plus the dative case of the uninflected infinitive ending in *-anne* [2] (*-enne;* occasionally *-enna, -ennæ, -enni, -enno;* and, with simplification of the double consonant, occasionally *-ane, -ano, -ene*). Occasionally the *to* is followed by an infinitive in *-an* [3] and occasionally by an infinitive in *-ende* (*-endo*) (by confusion with the form of the present participle),

[1] According to Dr. Theodor Kolbe, in his *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien,* Bonn, 1912, § 205, *-a* occurs 620 times, *-e* 175 times, *-æ* 16 times, and *-i* twice. Once, too, we find an uninflected infinitive in *-an* (*bian,* 'be,' in *Mat.* 1.20); and once we have an uninflected infinitive without any ending (*do,* 'do,' in *Mat.* I. 16.9). See, too, Dr. H. A. Carpenter's *Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift,* Bonn, 1910, §§ 43, 51, and 77.

[2] For the relative frequency of these variant forms of the inflected infinitive, see Kolbe, *l. c.,* § 206, who states that *-anne* occurs 250 times, *-enne* 49 times, and the others only occasionally. He does not, however, mention the *-ene* form of the infinitive, of which an example is found in *L.* I. 8.10.

[3] Kolbe, *l. c.,* § 206, cites examples of the *-an* infinitive preceded by *to,* but not of the *-ende* infinitive. But we have instances of the latter, I think, in *L.* I. 7.16[a] and I. 9.14[c], in which *-ende* (*-endo*) is preceded by *to;* and in *Mat.* I. 17.13[b], in which *to* is omitted before *-ende.*

both of which forms are counted as inflected in this investigation. Very rarely, too, we have the *-anne* (*-enne*) infinitive not preceded by *to;*[4] and once preceded by *til.*[5]

While the dual nature of the Infinitive—the substantival and the verbal—is constantly borne in mind, the classification of the infinitive is based primarily on its Function in the sentence. According to function we have four chief uses of the infinitive, namely, the Substantival, the Predicative (or more Verbal), the Adverbial, and the Adjectival, each term here used as defined at length in the aforementioned monograph. And these chief uses are further subdivided here as there.

Accordingly I give a section to each distinctive use of the Infinitive and to certain Substitutes for the Infinitive. It will be observed that two uses not found in West-Saxon occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* namely, the Infinitive as the Object of a Preposition and the Imperative Use of the Infinitive; and that some new and interesting modifications of the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject have been discovered in the Northumbrian gloss. Again, although I have made the use rather than the form of the infinitive the determining factor in my section-division, I have everywhere sharply separated the inflected infinitive from the uninflected. And one of my chief problems has been to try to discover the grounds of differentiation between the two infinitives in the several uses. It is gratifying to find that the general principles governing the differentiation in West-Saxon apply with only slight modification to our Northumbrian gloss.

With each use, too, I have tried to estimate the bearing of the evidence derived from the *Lindisfarne Gospels* on the Origin of the constructions of the infinitive not only in the Northumbrian dialect but also in West-Saxon,—one of the two chief problems of my monograph referred to above. And, as an aid to such an estimate, with each use I have given the Latin cor-

[4] Mat. I. 17.13[a] and, possibly, 13[b] (with *-ende* for *-enne*); I. 20.11;—*L.* I. 10.15; 21.36[b];—*J.* I. 8.4.

[5] In *Mat.* 26.17[b].

respondents of the Lindisfarne infinitives. I have, moreover, made a minute study of the *Rushworth Gospels,* and, in rare or difficult passages, have compared the Rushworth rendering with the Lindisfarne.

For reasons stated in my "Preface," I have not treated the Order of Words.

The Voice of the Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* deserves special consideration, and is discussed in each section below. Here I need make only a few general comments on the two infinitives. Although, as in West-Saxon, the uninflected infinitive that is active in form is normally active in sense also, deviations from this norm are more common in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in West-Saxon. In several of the uses (subjective, objective, and predicative (with auxiliary verbs and with accusative subject)), sporadic examples occur of an uninflected infinitive that, though active in form, translates a Latin passive infinitive, and seems itself to be passive in sense. In far the majority of instances, however, the Lindisfarne uninflected infinitive that translates a Latin passive infinitive is itself active in sense. See on this topic the paragraph on the voice of the infinitive in each of the following sections, especially in Section II, where the matter is discussed at length with reference to the objective infinitive after verbs of commanding, etc.

The inflected infinitive is active in sense as in form except in the predicative use with *bia(n)* (*wosa*) to denote necessity (and occasionally—once—to denote purpose), in which it is exclusively passive in sense; in the predicative use with accusative subject[6] (in object clauses), in which, though occasionally active in sense, it usually translates a Latin passive gerundive, and is passive in sense; and in the final use, in which, though normally active in sense, it is possibly once or twice passive in sense. It is evident, therefore, that the use of the inflected infinitive in a passive sense is more extended in the *Lindisfarne*

[6] In what, for lack of a better name, I have denominated the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, the present participle, though active in form, is usually passive in sense. See Section XV below.

Gospels than in West-Saxon, a fact arising probably from the frequency of passive gerundives in the Latin original and from the aversion of the glossator to the use of the compound passive infinitive.

Of the strictly passive infinitive (that is, of the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus a perfect participle), I have found but two examples in the whole of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* which are quoted in the section on " the Predicative Infinitive with Auxiliary Verbs." The passive infinitive is rare, though not so rare, in West-Saxon, and in the latter, as in the two Lindisfarne examples, is due to Latin influence.

I. THE SUBJECTIVE INFINITIVE

A. The Active Infinitive

The active infinitive as the Subject of a finite verb is somewhat more frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* there being 66 examples (74 including the " Introductions ") in the former to 39 in the latter. As the subject of an active verb, the active infinitive occurs about 44 times (52 times including the " Introductions ") in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to 31 times in the *West-Saxon Gospels;* as the subject of a passive verb, it occurs about 22 times in the former to 8 times in the latter. Under the subjective use I include sentences having *hit* as the grammatical subject and the infinitive as the logical subject.

1. *With Active Finite Verb*

I consider first the active infinitive as the subject of active verbs. As in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* so in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the subjective infinitive is more frequently uninflected than inflected, the proportion in the latter being 26 to 18 (29 to 23 inclusive of the " Introductions ") to 17 to 14 in the former. In West-Saxon as a whole, however, the subjective infinitive is more frequently inflected than uninflected, there being 252 examples of the former to 104 of the latter. The

divergence from the West-Saxon norm in the translation and in the gloss of the *Gospels* is probably due to the fact that, in the Latin original and in the two renderings thereof, the infinitive is less frequently in proximity to a dative-governing adjective or verb, which dative-governing word in West-Saxon [7] attracted the uninflected infinitive into the inflected form.

The subjective infinitive that is active in form, whether uninflected or inflected, seems to me habitually active in sense. Occasionally, however, it translates a Latin passive infinitive, and seems itself passive in sense, as in the following:—*Mat.* 18.9^{b}: god *uel* betra ðe *is* an ege in lif ingeonga ðon tuoe ego hæbbe *gesende* in tintergo fyres = bonum tibi *est* uno oculo in uitam intrare quam duos oculos habentem *mitti* in gehennam ignis; *Mk.* 9.45^{b}: god *is* ðe halt ingeonga in lif æce ðon tuoege foet hæbbe *sende* in tintergo fyres = bonum *est* tibi claudum introire in uitam aeternam quam duos pedes habentem *mitti* in gehennam ignis; *Mk.* 9.47^{b}: god *is* ðe anege ingeonga in ric godes ðon tuoego ego hæbbe *gesende* on tintergo fyres = bonum *est* tibi luscum introire in regnum dei quam duos oculos habentem *mitti* in gehennam ignis. But in the majority of instances, even when translating a Latin passive infinitive, the Lindisfarne subjective infinitive that is active in form is active in sense, as in the following examples:—*Mat.* 22. 17: *is* rehtlic penningslæht *gesella* ðæm caseri *uel* no? = *licet* censum *dari* caesari an non? [8] *Mk.* 2.22: ah ðæt win niwe in byttum niwum *senda is* rehtlic = sed uinum nouum in utres nouos *mitti* debet; *J.* 3.14: suæ *gefeage uel oftersuiða gedeafnad is* sunu monnes = ita *exaltari oportet* filium hominis;—*Mat.* I. 8.9^{b}: æteawas fewr ana *uel* noht mara *se reht* godspellas *to onfoanne* = ostenditur quattuor tantum debere euangelia *suscipi; Mk.* 13.10: ærist *gerises to bodanne uel to foresægcane uel* ðætte he sie boden godspell = primum *oportet praedicari* euangelium; *L.* 13.16: ðios uutedlice dohter abrahames . . . ne *were* geris-

[7] See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 20-26.

[8] Cf. *L.* 20.22: *is* reht us *to seallanne* ðæt geafel ðæm caseri? = *licet* nobis *dare* tributum caesari?

nelic *uel* reht *to unbindanne uel to undoanne* of bend ðissum dæge symbles? = hanc autem filia (*sic*) abrahae . . . non *oportuit solui* a uinculo isto die sabbati? *Mk.* 12.14: *is gelefed to seallane* geafol ðæm caseri? = *licet dari* tributum caesari?

I. The Uninflected Infinitive only is found as the subject with the following verbs:—

bia(n), *be.*

bia(n), *be,* in predicative combination with Adjectives (occasionally with Nouns):

behoflic, *necessary, expedient.*

gewuna, *custom.*

gelicia, *please.*

scina, ordinarily *shine,* but here *be allowable,* translating *licuit.*

widliga, *corrupt.*

A few examples will suffice for illustration:—

Mat. 15.20: unðuenum uutedlice hondum *eatta* ne *widlas* ðone monno = non lotis autem manibus *manducare* non *coincinant* (*sic*) hominem.

L. 12.32: forðon *gelicade* woel feder iuer *gesealla* iuh ðæt ric = quia *complacuit* patri uestro *dare* uobis regnum.

Mk. 15.6: ðerh ðone dæge ðonne symbel *forgeafa gewuna wæs* him enne = Per diem autem festum *dimittere solebat* illis unum ex uinctis (or Predicate Nominative?).

II. The Inflected Infinitive only is found as the subject with the following verbs:—

behofia, *behoove.*

bia(n), *be,* in predicative combination with Adjectives (occasionally with Nouns):

darflic, *useful.*

longsum, *long, tedious.*

ned(e), *necessary.*

ðarf, *necessity.*

Typical examples are:—

Mat. I. 5.7: ðа *to talanna longsum is* = quos *enumerare longissimum* est.

Mat. 14.16[a]: cueð . . . ned is ðæt hia gegæ *uel ðarf is* him *to geonganne* = dixit . . . *necesse ire.*

III. The Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive are each found as the subject of the following verbs:—

bia(n), *be,* in predicative combination with Adjectives:

ge(h)risenlic (-hrisnelic), *fitting.*

god, *good.*

reht, *right, proper.*

rehtlic, *right, proper.*

gehrisa: see *gerisa.*

gerisa, *be fitting.*

The following are typical examples:—

Mat. 15.26[a, b]: ne *is god to onfoanne* hlaf ðara suna & *sende* hundum = non *est bonum* sumere panem filiorum et *mittere* canibus.

Mat. 23.23[a, b]: ðæs *is rehtlic uel rehtlic wære to doanne* & ða ne *forhycga* = haec *oportuit facere* et illa non *omittere.*

I now give, in a single alphabetic list, the complete statistics of the active infinitive as the Subject of active verbs (U.:[9] 29, of which 3 are in the "Introductions"; I.:[9] 23, of which 5 are in the "Introductions"):—

behofia, *behoove:* **U.**:[9] (0).—**I.**[9] (1): *L.* (1): 12.12.

bia(n) (wosa), *be:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (1): 20.23[a].—*Mk.* (1): 10.40[a].—**I.** (0).

bia(n) (wosa), plus an adjective (or occasionally a noun):—

— **behoflic,** *necessary, expedient:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 14.15.—**I.** (0).

— **darflic,** *useful:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): I. 3.7.

— **ge(h)risenlic (-hrisnelic),** *fitting:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 15.32[b].—**I.** (3): *L.* (3): 2.49; 13.16; 15.32[a].

[9] In the statistics here and elsewhere, U. = Uninflected Infinitive; I. = Inflected Infinitive.

bia(n) plus an adjective, continued:

— **gewuna,** *custom:* **U.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 15.6.—**I.** (0).

— **god,** *good:* **U.** (10): *Mat.* (3): 15.26[b]; 18.9[a,b].—*Mk.* (7): 7.27[b]; 9.43[a,b]; 9.45[a,b]; 9.47[a,b].—**I.** (5): *Mat.* (2): 15.26[a]; 17.4.—*Mk.* (2): 7.27[a]; 9.5.—*L.* (1): 9.33.

— **long,** *long, tedious:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 5.7.

— **ned(e),** *necessary:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 5.8[a].

— **reht,** *right, proper:* **U.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 13.7.—*I.* (4): *Mat.* (1): I. 8.9[b].—*Mk.* (1): I. 1.8[b].—*L.* (2): 17.10; 20.22.

—**rehtlic,** *right, proper:* **U.** (5): *Mat.* (4): 19.3[c]; 20.15; 22.17; 23.23[b].—*Mk.* (1): 2.22.—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 23.23[a].

—**ðarf,** *necessity:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 14.16[a].

forstonda, *be expedient:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 19.10.—*I.* (0).

forwosa, *be of advantage(?):* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 2.14(?).

gehrisa: see *gerisa.*

geliciga, *please:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 12.32.—*I.* (0).

gerisa (-hrisa), *be fitting:* **U.** (4): *L.* (4): I. 3.8; 17.25; 18.1[a,b].—**I.** (4): *Mk.* (1): 13.10.—*L.* (3): 11.42[a,b]; 13.14.

scina, usually *shine,* but here *be allowable:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 2.13(?).—**I.** (0).

widliga, *corrupt:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 15.20.—**I.** (0).

2. *With Passive Verbs*

The active infinitive is found as the subject of passive verbs about 22 times. The infinitive is inflected 10 times.

I. The Uninflected Infinitive only is found as the subject of the passive of the following verb:

alefa, *allow.*

II. The Inflected Infinitive only is found as the subject of the passive of the following verbs:—

(ge)sella, *give.*

lefa, *allow.*

III. The Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive

are each found as the subject of the passive of the following verbs:—

gedæfna, *be fitting.*

(ge)deafna: see *(ge)dæfna.*

(ge)lefa, *allow.*

A few examples will suffice for these three groups:—

Mk. 3.4[a,b,c]: *is alefed* hræstdagum wel *wyrce uel* yfle? ða sawele hal *gedoa uel losiga?* = *licet* sabbatis bene *facere* an male? animam saluam *facere* an *perdere?*

Mat. 13.11: forðon iuh *gesald is uel* wæs ðæt ge witte *uel to uutanne* clæno hryno = quia nobis *datum est nosse* mysteria.

L. 14.3: *is gelefed* on symbeldæge *gelecnia?* = *licet* sabbato *curare?*

Mat. 14.4: ne *is gelefed* ðe *to habbanne* ða *uel* hia = non *licet* tibi *habere* eam.

The complete statistics of the active infinitive as the subject of passive verbs are as follows (U.: 12, all in the Gospels proper; I.: 10, all in the Gospels proper):—

alefa, *allow:* **U.** (6): *Mk.* (3); 3.4[a,b,c].—*L.* (3): 5.9[a,b,c].—**I.** (0).

(ge)dæfna (deafna), *be fitting:* **U.** (2): *J.* (2): 3.14; 4.20.—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 19.5.

(ge)deafna: see *(ge)dæfna.*

(ge)lefa, *allow:* **U.** (4): *Mat.* (2): 12.11, 12.—*Mk.* (1): 10.2.—*L.* (1): 14.3.—**I.** (5): *Mat.* (2): 12.2; 14.4.—*Mk.* (2): 6.8; 12.14.—*L.* (1): 6.4[b].

(ge)sella, *give:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (2): *Mat.* (1): 13.11.—*L.* (1): 8.10.

lefa, *allow:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 2.26.

DIFFERENTIATION OF THE TWO INFINITIVES

Whether with active or with passive verbs, the Differentiation between the Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive as Subject in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* seems in the main to rest upon the same principle as in West-Saxon: "Verbs and verbal phrases that govern a dative (or occasionally a genitive) nor-

mally have the inflected infinitive as subject, especially if the infinitive is near its principal verb." [10] Accordingly, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in West-Saxon, we find that, as a rule, in a series of infinitives as subjects, although the first infinitive is inflected, the succeeding one is not, presumably because of its remoteness from the principal verb, as in *Mat.* 23.23[a,b]: ðæs *is rehtlic uel* rehtlic wære *to doanne* & ða ne *forhycga* = haec *oportuit facere* et illa non *omittere.*[11] In *L.* 11.42[a,b], however, each of the two infinitives is inflected despite the separation of the second from its finite verb (*geras*) by three words. Such a deviation from the general norm by the Lindisfarne glossator is due partly to analogy and partly to the lateness of the text, it is believed.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

As to the Origin of the Subjective Infinitive, the evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* tends to confirm the conclusion reached from the study of the idiom in West-Saxon, as stated in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* pp. 183-184, namely, that in West-Saxon the active infinitive, whether uninflected or inflected, as the subject of active verbs was a native idiom only slightly influenced by the Latin, but that as the subject of passive verbs it was an idiom borrowed from the Latin. This conclusion was there based on the paucity of the latter construction in the more original West-Saxon literature and on the nature of the Latin correspondents (their diversity in the one construction and their substantial uniformity in the other). As is to be expected, the correspondence between Latin original and Old English rendering is closer in the Lindisfarne gloss than in the West-Saxon translation. The Latin correspondents of the active Subjective Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* are as follows:— (1) with an active finite verb: an infinitive that is the subject of a finite verb (U.: 24; I.: 16); an accusative and infinitive

[10] See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 24.

[11] A complete list of the subjective infinitive in a series is given in Note 1 at the end of this section.

as the subject of a finite verb (U.: 5; I.: 5); a predicative infinitive with an auxiliary verb (U.: 0; I.: 2);—(2) with a passive verb: an infinitive that is the subject of a finite verb (U.: 11; I.: 8); an accusative and infinitive as the subject of a finite verb (U.: 1; I.: 2).

APPENDIX V

THE SUBJECTIVE INFINITIVE IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

In the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde,* XI, 1892, pp. 165-168, Professor W. L. van Helten gives an instructive discussion of the Infinitive as Subject in Dutch, in an article entitled "Over het Gebruik van den Infinitief als Subject, Object, of in Verbinding met *Dan.*" I have been delighted to find that in this article, which I first saw during the summer of 1917, Professor van Helten's explanation of the differentiation between the uninflected infinitive and the inflected infinitive as subject in Dutch and in Old High German tallies in the large with that offered by me for West-Saxon and for Old High German in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saron,* pp. 20-26, 232, and in the present section suggested for the Northumbrian as represented in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Says Professor van Helten: "Gelijk vanzelf spreekt, is hier aan de onbep. wijs zonder *te* het praedicat van oorspronkelijkheid toe te kennen. Het gerundium kan niet anders zijn dan het product eener navolging, als wier hoofzakelijke factor zonder twijfel mag worden aangemerkt de bekende neiging der Germ. dialecten om in verloop van tijd steeds meer en meer den oorspronk. enkelen infin. door dien met *te* te vervangen. Hoofdzakelijke, zei ik; want in een bepaald geval is de wijziging der woordvoeging langs een anderen weg en reeds tamelijk vroeg tot stand gekomen, t. w. in zinnen, welke een adject, met een begrip '(niet) geschikt, nuttig, gemakkelijk' als gezegde bevatten: bij verbinding van zulk een bijv. nw. met een nomen als subject was naturlijk het gebruik van een gerundium als bepaling van 't

adject. de van rechtswege vereischte constructie, als b. v. in 't Ohd. 'sin gisiuni ist uns *zi sehanne* urgilo swar,' O. 4, 24, 16; 'hwedar ist gazelira za quedanna?' Frg. th. 3, 14; 'wedar ist *odira zi quedanne?*' Tat. 54, 6; 'dhazs izs widharzuomi . . . ist eomanne *zi chilaubanne,*' Is. cap. 3, § 3; bij koppeling van 't bijv. nw. met een infin. als onderwerp was daarentegen oorspr. alleen de onbep. w. zonder praepositie op haar plaats, als in 't Ohd '*guot* ist thir zi libe *ingangen* wanaheilan odo halgan,' Tat. 95, 4; 'mir ist *guot* ze gote *haften,*' N. Ps. 72, 28; 'wieo *guot* ist sament *puen,*' ib. 132, 1; door verwarring der beide constructies, d. i. ten gevolge van den invloed, door de eerste op de laatste uitgeofend, had zich intusschen een woordvoeging ontwikkeld, gelijk we waarnemen in: '*guot* ist uns hir *zi wesanne,*' Tat. 91, 2; 'ist *kuot ze sagenne* dina gnada,' N. Ps. 91, 3; '*unodi* ist iz harto . . . thia kleini al *zi sagenne,*' O. 5, 14, 3; 'iu ist *unnuzze* fore tage uf *ze stanne,*' N. Ps. 126, 2; 'nist *biderbi zi gihiwenne,*' Tat. 100, 5; enz.; vgl. ook. O. S. '*god* is it her *te wesanne,*' Hel. 3138."

Concerning the Subjective Infinitive in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 231-233.

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the passive infinitive proper, that is, of the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus a past participle, in the subjective use, I have found no example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* At times, however, as stated above in the discussion of the voice of the subjective infinitives, an active infinitive seems to be passive in sense. Occasionally the Latin passive infinitive is turned by a passive finite verb, as in *L.* 17.25: ærist uutedlice *gehriseð* him feolo geðrouia *uel* geðolia & *ðætte he se forcumen* from cneoreso ðasum = Primum autem *oportet* illum multa pati et *reprobari* a generatione hac. But more frequently we find that, by some sort of periphrasis, the Latin passive infinitive is turned by a Lindisfarne infinitive that is active in sense as well as in form: see above, pp. 94-95.

NOTES

1. *The Subjective Infinitive in a Series.*—In the following passages we have a series of infinitives in which the first is inflected, but the succeeding is not: *Mat.* 23.23[a,b], quoted on p. 96 above; *Mat.* 15.26[a,b]; *Mk.* 7.27[a,b]; and *L.* 15.32[a,b]. In *L.* 11.42[a,b], each of the two infinitives is inflected. It seems unnecessary to give the series in which each infinitive is uninflected.

2. *The Subjective Infinitive Alternates with a Clause* in *Mat.* 14.16: cueð . . . *ned is ðæt hia gegae uel ðarf is* him *to geonganne* = dixit . . . necesse *ire;* and in *L.* 8.10, 13.14.

3. *The Choice between an Uninflected Infinitive and an Inflected Infinitive* is occasionally given, as in *Mat.* I. 2.14: of ðæm wutetlice ne in aldum gehrine *uel* æe æfter unseofuntigvm trahteras *uel* recceras eftniwige *uel* girihte hwæt scean ne in niwe *for* ænig *wæs* ængum *to boetanne uel to rihtannæ uel giboeta* = quibus utique nec in ueteri instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit nec in nouo *profuit emendasse.*

II. THE OBJECTIVE INFINITIVE

A. The Active Infinitive

1. *With Active Finite Verb*

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* the active infinitive as the Object of an active verb is more commonly uninflected than inflected, the proportion being 129 to 32 (or 157 to 37 including the "Introductions") in the former and 94 to 20 in the latter.

The objective infinitive that is active in form, whether uninflected or inflected, is almost without exception active in sense, I believe. In the two following passages, the active *druncniga* translates a Latin passive infinitive, and is probably passive in sense:—*Mat.* 14.30: miððy ongann *uel* ongunne *druncnia uel* gedrince = cum *coepisset mergeri; L.* 12.45[e]: onginneð miððy slaa ða cnæhtas & ðiuwas & ætta & drinca & *druncgnia uel*

ðætte se druncenig = *coeperit* percutere pueros et ancillas et edere et bibere et *inebriari.* Usually, however, although translating a Latin passive infinitive (or occasionally a gerundive that is passive in sense), the Lindisfarne objective infinitive that is active in form is also active in sense, as in *Mat.* 19.7[a,b]: hwæt forðon—[= blank] *bebead sella* boc freodomas & forleta? = quid ergo moses mandauit *dari* librum repudii et dimittere? *Mat.* I. 20.1: *biddendum sealla* of heofnum becen = *petentibus dari* de cælo signum; *Mat.* I. 17.1[b]: ne *synngige gelærde* hates = non *moechandum docens* iubet; *Mk.* 10.49: *geheht* hine *ceiga* = *praecepit* illum *uocari; L.* 12.39: ne walde *leta ðerhhdelfa* hus his = non *sineret perfodi* domum suam;—*L.* 23.2[b]: ðiosne woe gemitton . . . *forbeadende uel* woerdende gæfelo *to seallanne uel* ðætte se gesald ðæm caseri = hunc inuenimus . . . *prohibentem* tributa *dari* caesari; etc., etc. In passages like these, of which there are numerous examples, some scholars may prefer to consider that the infinitive here is predicative, and that the accusative, instead of being, as I believe, the object of the infinitive, is its subject. They would, of course, consider the infinitive passive in sense, though active in form. Against this sort of interpretation in West-Saxon I have urged what seemed (and seem) to me cogent reasons in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 29-30; and these reasons, on the whole, seem to me to apply equally well to this idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* The only noteworthy difference is this: in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the accusative usually precedes the infinitive, whereas in the West-Saxon translations it usually follows the infinitive. But, as the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is an interlinear gloss, we expect, as we find, that the position of the Old English accusative will be identical with that in the Latin original. Hence the position of the accusative in the gloss is not significant, although in the West-Saxon translations it is, I think, highly significant, as I have tried to show in the discussion above referred to. Concerning the voice of the objective infinitive in the other Germanic languages, see Note 8 below and *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 333.

I. The Uninflected Infinitive only is found as object with the following verbs:— [12]

beginna (1), *begin* (W. S.: U. and I.).
bidda (2), *invite* (W. S.: U. and I.).
bodia (1), *announce* (W. S.: I. only).
cwoeða (4), *say* (W. S.: lacking).
eawa (1), *show* (W. S.: lacking).
foregehata (1), *order* (W. S.: lacking).
forgeafa (2), *allow* (W. S.: the same).
gearwiga (1), *attempt* (W. S.: lacking).
geblinna (1), *cease* (W. S.: lacking, but the simplex, *blinnan,* has U. only).
gehata (7), *order* (W. S.: same, but *gehatan,* 'promise,' takes I. only).
gelæra (1), *teach* (W. S.: lacking, but the simplex, *læran,* has I. only).
gelefa (4), *allow* (W. S.: lacking, but the simpler, *liefan,* has I. only).
gewiga (1) **(= giwiga)**, *demand* (W. S.: lacking).
gewil(l)niga (2), *wish* (W. S.: U. and I.; see *wil(l)niga* in III below).
hata (7), *order* (W. S.: the same).
inginna (1), *begin* (W. S.: lacking; but see *aginna* in II below and *onginna* in III below).
leta (2), *allow* (W. S.: the same).
oncnawa (2), *know* (W. S.: lacking).
woena (1), *ween, think* (W. S.: U. and I.).
wuta (4), *know* (W. S.: I. only).

Typical examples are:—

Mat. I. 19.6^{b}: becon biddendum Iones becon *sella bodade uel* sægde = Pharisaeis signum petentibus ionæ signum *dari prædicit.*

Mat. I. 19.4^{b}, 5: *cueð* ebalsung in halig gast ne *forletta* . . .

[12] The figure in parenthesis with each verb indicates the number of its occurences in this construction. For the sake of comparison, I give in succeding parentheses the construction of each verb in West-Saxon.

& rehtnisse of word idlum in dæge domes *forgelda* = dicens blasphemiam in sanctum spiritum non *remitti* . . . et rationem de uerbo otioso in diem iudicii *reddi.*

Mat. 27.64: *gehat* forðon *gehalda uel* ðætte sie gehalden byrgenn = *iube* ergo *custodiri* sepulchrum.—*Mat.* I. 16.9ª: hreunisse *gedo uel gewyrce hates* = penitentiam *agere iubens.*—*Mat.* 7.11: *wutas* ge godo *gesealla* sunum iurum? = *nostis* bona *dare* filiis uestris?

II. The Inflected Infinitive only is found as the object of the following verbs:— [13]

aginna (1), *begin* (W. S.: U. and I.; see *beginna* in I above and *onginna* in III below).

forbeada (1), *forbid* (W. S.: U. and I.; see *bebeada* in III below).

gesoeca (1), *seek* (W. S.: lacking, but the simplex, *secan,* has U. and I.; see *soeca* in III).

getella (1), *compute* (W. S.: lacking, but the simplex, *tellan,* has I. only).

hyhta (2), *hope* (W. S.: lacking, but the compound, *gehyhtan,* has I. only).

sella (1), *give* (W. S.: U. and I.).

ðafiga (1), *allow* (W. S.: lacking, but the compound, *geðafian,* has U. and I.).

The following are typical examples:—

L. 11.38: ðonne *agann* bituih him getalade *to coeðanne* = pharisaeus autem *coepit* intra se reputans *dicere.*

L. 6.34: gif huerf gie sellas ðæm from ðæm gie *hyhtað to onfoane* = si mutuum dederitis his a quibus *speratis accipere.*

L. 22.5: *ðafando woeron* feh him *to seallanne uel gesealanne* = *pacti sunt* pecuniam illi *dare.*

III. The Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive are each found as the object with the following verbs:— [14]

[13] See the footnote to page 104.

[14] See the footnote to page 104. In this section the first figure stands for the uninflected infinitive; the second, for the inflected infinitive.

bebeada (6 and 1), *order* (W. S.: the same).

eftongeata [15] (1), *recognize* (W. S.: lacking, but the simplex, *ongietan,* has I. only).

habba (3 and 1), *have* (W. S.: I. only).

læra (2 and 1), *teach* (W. S.: I. only).

ondreda (1 and 2), *fear* (W. S.: the same).

onginna (84 and 3), *begin* (W. S.: the same).

onsacca (2 and 1), *refuse* (W. S.: lacking).

soeca (6 and 18), *seek* (W. S.: the same).

wil(l)niga (5 and 2), *wish* (W. S.: the same).

The following will serve as examples:—

Mat. 19.7[a,b]: huæt forðon—[= blank] *bebead sella* boc freodomæs & *forleta?* = quid ergo moses mandauit *dari librum* repudii et *dimittere?*—*L.* I. 7.12[a,b,c]: ðegnum *bebead* & from dærstum esuicnise *to behaldane* & ða ðaðe lichoma acuellas ne scyniga ne ðæt in oehtnise huætd (*sic*) hia wero sprecendo *geðencæ* = Discipulis *præcepit* et a fermento hypocrisis *cauere* et eos qui corpus occidunt non *metuere* nec in persecutione quid locuturi sint *cogitare.*

J. 8.26[a,b]: feolo ic *hafo* of iuih *spreca uel to sprecane* & *doema* = multa *habeo* de uobis *loqui* et *iudicare.*—*L.* 14.14: eadig ðu bist forðon hia ne *habbað* eft *to seallanne* ðe = beatus eris quia non *habent retribuere* tibi.

Mat. I. 17.4[a], 5: næfræ *gesueriga laeres* ne . . . suiga *wiðstonda* = omnino *iurare docet* nec . . . mutuare uolenti *resistere.*—*L.* I. 6.11: eðmodnise *læreð* & ne *to forbeadane* mæhto on his noma doende = humilitatem *docet* et non *prohiberi* uirtutes in ipsius nomine facientem.

Mat. 2.22: *ondreard* ðider *fara uel to færanne* = *timuit* illuc *ire.*—*Mat.* 1.20: nelle ðu ðe *ondrede uel* forht bian *to onfoanne* maria = noli *timere accipere* mariam.

Mat. 4.17[a,b]: *ongann . . . bodage* & *cuoeða* = *coepit . . . praedicare* et *dicere.*—*Mk.* 13.4: ðonne ðas alle *onginnað to*

[15] An alternative rendering with an inflected infinitive is given in the only passage in which this verb occurs in this use.

endanne uel ðatte hia se geendado = quando haec omnia incipient *consummari.*—*L.* 19.37[b]: *ongunnon* alle ða menigo ofstigendra gefeadon *uel* gefeande *to herganno* god = *coeperunt* omnes turbae discendentium gaudentes *laudare* deum.—*L.* 21.28[b]: ðæm & (*sic* for *uel?*) ðas uutedlice *to wosanne onginnendum* = his autem *fieri incipientibus.*

Mk. I. 3.19[b]:—[blank] becon *uel* tacon soecendum *sealla onsoc* = Pharisaeis signum quaerentibus *dari negat.*—*Mk.* I. 1.15: ne *onsoce uel* nalde onsacca soðða *to tellanne uel to clænsanne* him = *negaret* denique *amputasse* sibi.

L. 5.18[b,c]: *sohton* hine *gebrenge* & *gesette* fora hine = *quaerebant* eum *inferre* et *ponere* ante eum.—*Mat.* 21.46: *sohton* hine *to haldanne* ondreardon ða menigo = et *quaerentes* eum *tenere* timuerunt turbas.

L. 23.20: *willnade forleta* ðone hælend = *uolens dimittere* iesum.—*L.* 22.15: willum ic *wilnade* ðis eostro *gebrucca uel to eattanne* iuih mið = desiderio *desideraui* hoc pascha *manducare* uobiscum.—*L.* 23.8[b] *wæs* forðon *willnande* of menigo tid *to geseanne* hine = *erat* enim *cupiens* ex multo tempore *uidere* eum.

The complete statistics of the active infinitive as the Object of active verbs follow (U.: 157, of which 28 are in the "Introductions"; I.: 37, of which 5 are in the "Introductions"):—

aginna, *begin:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 11.38.

bebeada, *command:* **U.** (6): *Mat.* (2): 19.7[a,b].—*Mk.* (1): 8.6(?).—*L.* (3): I. 6.18; I. 7.12[b], 13[a].—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.12[a].

beginna, *begin:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 3.8.—**I.** (0).

bidda, *request:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.1.—*L.* (1): I. 9.5.—**I.** (0).

bodiga, *announce, declare:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 19.6[b].—**I.** (0).

cwoeða, *say, declare:* **U.** (4): *Mat.* (3): I. 19.3[b]; I. 19.4[b], 5.—*Mk.* (1): 5.43[a].—**I.** (0).

eawa, *show:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 3.7.—**I.** (0).

eftongeata, *recognize:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 15.4[a] (inter-

changing here with an inflected infinitive).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 15.4[a].

forbeada, *forbid:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 23.2[f].

foregehata, *order, command:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.16[c]. —**I.** (0).

forgeafa, *allow, permit:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (1): 19.8.—*L.* (1): 9.59.—**I.** (0).

gearwiga, *attempt, seek:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.13[a](?). Professor Cook makes *forcuoede* " opt. pret. 3rd sg.," as is possible; but I take it to be a scribal error for *forcuoeðe.*—**I.** (0).

geblinna, *cease:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 5.4.—**I.** (0).

gehata, *order, command:* **U.** (7): *Mat.* (5): I. 20.9[b]; 8.18; 14.9; 27.58, 64.—*Mk.* (2): 6.27; 10.49.—**I.** (0).

gelæra, *teach:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 17.1[b].—**I.** (0).

gelefa, *allow, permit:* **U.** (4): *Mat.* (1): 24.43.—*L.* (3): 4.41[c]; 8.32[b]; 9.61.—**I.** (0).

gesoeca, *seek:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *J.* (1): 11.8.

getella, *compute, reckon:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 14.28[b](?).

gewiga (for **giwiga**), *demand, request:* **U.** (1): *J.* (1): I. 6.17[a].—**I.** (0).

gewil(l)niga, *wish, desire:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (2): 13.17[a,b].—**I.** (0).

habba, *have:* **U.** (3): *J.* (3) 8.26[a,b]; 16.12.—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 14.14.

hata, *order, command:* **U.** (7): *Mat.* (4): I. 1.11; I. 16.9[a]; I. 17.2; I. 20.13.—*Mk.* (1): 8.7.—*L.* (2): 8.55[a]; 19.15.—**I.** (0).

hyhta, *hope:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (2): *L.* (2): 6.34; 22.8[c].

inginna, *begin:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 14.9.—**I.** (0).

læra, *teach, instruct:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 17.4[a], 5.—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.11.

leta, *let, allow:* **U.** (2): *Mk.* (1): 1.34[a].—*L.* (1): 12.39.—**I.** (0).

oncnawa, *know:* **U.** (2): *Mk.* (1): I. 2.3(?); I. 2.4(?).—**I.** (0).

ondreda, *dread, fear:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 2.22.—**I.** (2): *Mat.* (1): 1.20.—*L.* (1): 9.45.

onginna, *begin:* **U.** (85): *Mat.* (16): I. 7.10; 4.17[a,b]; 11.7[a], 20; 12.1[a,b]; 14.30; 16.21; 18.24[a]; 24.49; 26.22[b], 37[b,c], 74[a,b]. —*Mk.* (36): I. 1.10[a]; 1.45[a,b]; 2.23; 4.1; 5.17, 18; 6.2, 7, 34, 55; 8.11[a], 25, 31[a], 32; 10.32, 41, 47[a,b]; 11.15; 12.1; 13.5; 14.19[a,b], 33[a,b], 65[a,b,c,d], 69, 71[a,b], 72; 15.8, 18.—*L.* (30): 4.21; 5.21[a]; 7.15, 24[a], 38, 49: 9.12; 11.29[b], 53[a,b]; 12.1[b], 45[b,c,d,e]; 13.25[a,b]; 26; 14.18, 29, 30[b]; 15.14, 24, 28; 19.45; 20.9; 21.7[b]; 22.23; 23.2[a], 30.—*J.* (3): 4.47; 13.5[a,b].—**I.** (3): *Mk.* (1): 13.4.—*L.* (2): 19.37[b]; 21.28[b].

onsacca, *refuse, deny:* **U.** (2): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.19[b].—*L.* (1): I. 8.8[a]. Professor Cook considers *gescilde* here " ind. pret. 3rd sg.," as is possible, but I take it to be an infinitive.—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.15.

sella, *give:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *J.* (1): 5.26.

soeca, *seek:* **U.** (6): *L.* (3): 5.18[b,c]; 17.33.—*J.* (3): 8.37; 10.39; 19.12[a].—**I.** (18): *Mat.* (1): 21.46.—*Mk.* (1): 12.12. —*L.* (7): 6.19; 9.9; 11.54; 13.24[b]; 19.3, 47; 20.19.—*J.* (9): I. 5.3[b]; I. 5.5[b]; 5.18[a]; 7.1, 19, 20, 25, 30; 8.40.

ðafiga, *consent, agree:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 22.5.

wil(l)niga, *wish, desire:* **U.** (5): *Mat.* (1): 12.38.—*L.* (2): 17.22; 23.20.—*J.* (2): I. 6.14[b]; 7.44.—**I.** (2): *L.* (2): 22.15; 23.8[b].

woena, *ween, think:* **U.** (1): *J.* (1): 5.39.—**I.** (0).

wuta, *know:* **U.** (4): *Mat.* (2): 7.11; 16.3.—*L.* (2): 11.13, 12.56.—**I.** (0).

2. *With Passive Verbs*

The active infinitive as the retained object of passive verbs occurs about six times in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Of these six infinitives, two are inflected.

The following examples are typical:—

L. I. 7.10[a]: mið ælarua *gehriordage gebeden wæs* = Apud pharisaeum *prandere rogatus.*

J. I. 8.4: *gehaten* is ðegnum *gesaeccanne* = *iubetur* discipulis *nuntiare.*

The complete statistics of the active infinitive as the object of passive verbs are as follows (U.: 4, all in the "Introductions"; I.: 2, of which 1 is in the "Introductions"):—

(ge)bidda, *invite:* **U.** (1): *L.* (1): 7.10[a].—**I.** (0).

(ge)hata, *order, command:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *J.* (1): I. 8.4.

(ge)lefa, *allow, permit:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 12.4 (see Note 6 at the end of this section).

(ge)neda, *compel:* **U.** (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 7.3[a] (or Consecutive?).—**I.** (0).

(ge)ðreatiga, *compel, force:* **U.** (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 6.19; I. 7.2 (or Consecutive in each example?).—*I.* (0).

DIFFERENTIATION OF THE TWO INFINITIVES

The Differentiation between the Two Infinitives as Object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* appears to rest upon the same general principle as in West-Saxon: the uninflected infinitive usually appears to the modern Englishman as a direct object, and is oftenest found with verbs whose noun object would be in the accusative case. On the other hand, the inflected infinitive, as a rule, appears to the modern mind as an "indirect object," under which phrase are included genitive (occasionally also instrumental) objects as well as dative objects, and is usually found after verbs whose noun objects would be in the genitive or the dative (occasionally in the instrumental). The double construction of uninflected infinitive and inflected infinitive is usually due to the double regimen of the governing verb, as I have sought to show is true in West-Saxon.[16] As my parallel columns above show, not a few apparent, if not real, divergences from the West-Saxon custom appear in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* But these divergences do not seem to me in any appreciable degree to invalidate the general principle stated. The chief divergences consist in the fact that, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* some verbs (*beginna, bidda, gewilniga*) have the uninflected infinitive only as object, or some verbs (*aginna, forbeada, (ge)*-

[16] See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 60-71.

soeca, and *ðafiga*) have the inflected infinitive only as object, whereas in each group in West-Saxon these verbs are found with both infinitives as object. But, as in almost every one of these instances the objective infinitive is found only once in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the divergence may arise, not from a difference of idiom, but from paucity of texts in the Northumbrian dialect. Again, the objective infinitives (whether uninflected or inflected) that occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* but not in West-Saxon, seem to me in the large to conform to the general principle stated above. Moreover, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* with the more numerously recorded objective infinitives, of whichever variety, the usage is almost identical with that in Anglo-Saxon. I believe, therefore, that, despite the number of divergences between the objective infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and in West-Saxon, some of which may be due to analogy and some to the lateness of the text, no one will find in these divergences any ground for questioning the essential correctness of the general principle above laid down as explaining the use of the one infinitive or the other. On the contrary, I believe that the evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* strengthens the theory that was originally based on West-Saxon texts only.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Owing to the small number of verbs occurring more than once or twice with the Objective Infinitive, the *Lindisfarne Gospel* throws little light on the Origin of the idiom. So far as the evidence goes, however, it seems to me to tend to confirm the general results obtained for West-Saxon in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 185-192. Of the verbs having only the uninflected infinitive as object, listed on p. 104 above, only two (*gehata,* 'order,' and *hata,* 'order') occur over a half dozen times; and with these the usage in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is identical with that in West-Saxon, in each of which the idiom seems native. The Latin correspondents for *gehata* are an objective infinitive active, 1; a passive infinitive with accusative subject, 6; for *hata:* an objective infinitive, 3 (active, 2;

passive, 1); a passive infinitive with accusative subject, 4. Of the verbs having only the inflected infinitive as object, only one occurs over a single time, and that only twice (*hyhta,* 'hope')—a basis too slender upon which to base a theory. Of the verbs having as object both the uninflected infinitive and the inflected infinitive, only the following occur over a half dozen times: *bebeada,* 'order'; *onginna,* 'begin'; *soeca,* 'seek'; and *wil(l)niga,* 'wish.' The usage with each is identical with that in West-Saxon, and the objective use with each seemed native in West-Saxon for reasons stated in the discussion referred to above. The Lindisfarne evidence seems to me confirmatory of that conclusion. The Latin correspondents for these words respectively are:—for *bebeada:* U.: an objective infinitive, active, 5; a passive infinitive with accusative subject, 1;—I.: an objective infinitive, active, 1;—for *onginna:* U.: an objective infinitive (active, 82; passive, 2), 84; a final infinitive, 1;—I.: an objective infinitive (active, 2; passive, 1), 3;—*soeca:*—U.: an objective infinitive, active, 6;—I.: an objective infinitive, active, 18;—*wil(l)niga:*—U.: an objective infinitive, active, 5;—I.: an objective infinitive, active, 2. The active infinitive as the retained object is due to Latin influence, seldom occurring except when the Latin original has the same idiom. For the active objective infinitive as a whole, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the Latin correspondents are as follows:—(1) with active verbs:—U.: an objective infinitive, 138 (active, 130; passive, 8); a passive infinitive with accusative subject, 18; a gerundive without *esse* and passive in sense, 1;—I.: an objective infinitive, 34 (active, 33; passive, 1); a passive infinitive with accusative subject, 2; a noun in the accusative, 1;—(2) with passive verbs:—U.: an objective infinitive, active, as retained object of a passive verb, 3; a subjunctive, active, 1;—I.: an objective infinitive, active, as the retained object of a passive verb, 1; a subjective infinitive, active, 1.

For the Objective Infinitive in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 233-236, and the articles on the Infinitive in Dutch by Professor W. L. van Helten, cited in my "Bibliography."

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the strictly passive infinitive (that is, the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus a past participle) as the object of a verb, I have found no clear example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Usually the Latin passive infinitive is rendered by an active infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as illustrated above, pp. 102-103.

NOTES

1. *The Objective Infinitive in a Series.*—In the following we have a series of two or more objective infinitives the first of which is inflected, but the succeeding ones are not:—*L.* I. 7.12[a,b], 13[a]: ðegnum *bebead* & from dærstum esuicnise *to behaldane* & ða ðaðe lichoma acuellas ne *scyniga* ne ðæt in oehtnise huætd (*sic*) hia wero sprecendo *geðencœ* = Discipulis *praecepit* et a fermento hypocrisis *cauere* et eos qui corpus occidunt non *metuere* nec in persecutione quid locuturi sint *cogitare.*—I do not give here the series in which each infinitive is uninflected.

2. *The Choice between an Uninflected Infinitive and an Inflected Infinitive* is given at times, as in the following:—*L.* 22.15: willum ic *wilnade* ðis eostro *gebrucca uel to eattanne* iuih mið = desiderio *desideraui* hoc pascha *manducare* nobiscum; *Mat.* I. 15.4: *eftongeattas* . . . lufu geworden ðing *gesella uel to sellanne* = *recognoscant* . . . fidem factae rei *tradere; Mat.* 2.22: *ondreard* ðider *fara uel to færanne* = *timuit* illuc *ire; Mk.* 1.34[a]: *nalde leta spreca* hia *uel* ne *lefde* hia *to spreccanne* = non *sinebat loqui* ea; *L.* 21.7[b]: miððy *geworða uel* ðætte sie *uel to wosanne onginnað* = cum *fieri incipient; J.* 8.26[a]: feola ic *hafo* of iuih *spreca uel to sprecanne* [17] & doema = multa *habeo* de uobis *loqui* et iudicare; *J.* 16.12: gett *uel* forðor menigo *uel* feolo ic *hafo* iuh *gecuoeða uel to sægcganne* [17] = adhuc multa *habeo* uobis *dicere; J.* 8.37: ah gie

[17] The infinitives may depend on the substantive rather than the verb: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 43.

soecas mec *gecearfa uel to accuellanne* = sed *quaeritis* me *interficere; J.* 10.39: *ib.*

3. *An Interchange of Objective Infinitive and of Objective Clause* occurs in the following:—*Mat.* 27.64: *gehat* forðon *gehalda uel ðætte sie gehalden* byrgenn = *iube* ergo *custodiri* sepulchrum; *Mk.* 13.4, quoted above, p. 106; *L.* 9.59: *forgef uel gelef* me ærist *geonga* & *ðæt ic byrga* fæder min = *permitte* mihi primum *ire* et *sepelire* patrem meum; *L.* 21.7^{b}, quoted above, in Note 2, for another purpose; *L.* 12.56: onsione earðes . . . *wutað* gie *gecunnia uel* ðætte *see gecostad* = faciem terrae . . . *nostis probare; L.* 12.45^{e}, quoted above, p. 102; *L.* 23.2^{b}, quoted on p. 103 above.

4. *A Lindisfarne Noun in -Ing (-Ung) Translates a Latin Objective Infinitive* in *L.* 7.45: ne blann *cossetunges foeta* mine = non cessauit *osculari* pedes meos (Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: ne geswac ðæt heo mine fet ne cyste). See Note 3 to Chapter II, p. 65, for Professor Curme's contention that *cossetunges* is here a gerund, and that *foeta* is its accusative object. See, also, Note 4 to Section XIII of the present chapter, for an example of an inflected infinitive interchanging with a verbal noun in *-nes(s)*.

5. *Infinitive after a Finite Verb Passive in Form, but Active in Sense.*—In the following passages we have an active infinitive that is the object of finite verbs that are passive in form, but active in sense, the passive forms being due to the glossator's mistaking the Latin deponent verbs for passives:—*(ge)cunniga,* 'attempt': *Mat.* I. 5.2 and I. 5.9:—*forgetta* 'forget': *Mk.* 8.14.—For the same phenomenon in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 72.

6. *A Mixed Construction* occurs in *Mat.* 12.4: hlafas . . . gebrec ða *neron gelefed* him *to gebrucanne* = panes . . . quos non *licebat* ei *edere.* We seem to have a cross between the subjective use of the infinitive (ða *næs gelefed* him *to gebrucanne*) and the normal use of the retained objective infinitive (ða he *næs gelefed to gebrucanne*). Although I have listed *to ge-*

brucanne in the passage under discussion as an imperfect example of the retained objective, the infinitive might be considered as denoting purpose.

7. *An Inflected Objective Infinitive without "To"* occurs in *J.* I. 8.4, quoted on p. 109 above.

8. *The Voice of the Infinitive in Old High German.*—A very thoughtful discussion of the Voice of the Infinitive in Old High German is given by Dr. Paulus Kaufmann, in his Leipzig dissertation, *Ueber Genera Verbi im Althochdeutschen Besonders bei Isidor und Tatian,* Erlangen, 1912, which appeared subsequent to the sending of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* to the printer, and was procured by me only recently. As its title indicates, this dissertation considers the voice of the infinitive not only in its Objective use, but in all the uses that are represented in the texts studied by its author. As is evident from the following quotation from § 66 of this dissertation, Dr. Kaufmann is more insistent than I am in his contention against the passive rendering of a Germanic infinitive that is active in form: "Passive Bedeutung hat der Infinitiv jedoch niemals, wie das für die Fälle verschiedentlich angenommen wurde, wo er zur Wiedergabe von lat. passivem Infinitiv oder lat. Gerundivum dient. Es ist jedenfalls ein am Lateinischen ausgebildetes und an seinem Formensystem sich orientierendes Sprachgefühl, das hier passives Genus Verbi zu empfinden glaubt. Die Sache liegt vielmehr so, dass in solchen Fällen der deutsche Infinitiv teils activisch und teils neutral ist. Danach sind die Belege aus Isidor und Tatian in zwei Klassen zu sondern." Many of Dr. Kaufmann's neutral infinitives, given in his § 68, seem to me passive in sense, as in *Isidor* 93.1: filius hominis *tradendus est* in manus hominum = mannes sun *ist zi sellenne* in hant manno.

III. OTHER SUBSTANTIVAL USES OF THE INFINITIVE

Of Substantival Uses of the Infinitive Other than as Subject and as Object only a very few examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.*

A. As a Predicate Nominative

Of the infinitive as a Predicate Nominative I have found but two examples, the first one of which is doubtful, the finite verb having to be supplied in both Latin and Northumbrian:—*Mat.* I. 1.4: arwyrðe werc *uel* winn ah froecenlic foreonfeng *uel* dearfscip ængum *to doemenne* of oðrum = pius labor sed periculosa praesumptio *iudicare* de ceteris;—*J.* 19.40: sua ðeau iuðeum *is bebyrge uel bidelfa* = sicut mox (*sic* for *mos*) iudeis *est sepelire.*

In one of these examples, the infinitive is inflected, probably because of its proximity to a datival adjective or noun.

The examples of the infinitive as a predicate nominative are too few in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to determine the origin of the idiom. But the probability is that the idiom is partly of native origin and partly of foreign origin, the reasons for which view are given in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 193.

B. As an Appositive

Somewhat more frequent is the use of the infinitive as an Appositive to a noun or pronoun. In this use the infinitive is usually uninflected, but occasionally it is inflected owing to its proximity to a dative-governing adjective. The examples in full are as follows:—

1. Uninflected:

Mat. 9.5[a,b]: *huæt* is eaður *cuoeða* forgefon biðon ðe synna *uel cueða* aris? = *quid est* facilius *dicere* dimittuntur tibi peccata aut *dicere* surge?

Mk. 2.9[b]: *Hwæt* is eaður to coeðanne ðæm eorðcryple forgefen biðon ðe synno *uel cuoeða* aris? = *quid* est facilius dicere paralitico dimittantur tibi peccata an *dicere* surge?

L. 5.23[a,b]: *huoeðer* is eaðor *gecuoæða* forgefen biðon ðe synna *uel cuoeða* aris = *quid* est facilius *dicere* dimittuntur peccata an *dicere* surge?

2. Inflected:

Mk. 2.9[a], already quoted above.

In *Mk.* 2.9[a,b] we have a series of two appositive infinitives the first of which, in proximity to a dative-governing adjective, *eaður,* is inflected, but the second is not. But, in *Mat.* 9.5[a] and *L.* 5.23[a], the infinitive, though next to *eaður,* is not inflected.

The situation in the West-Saxon is much the same both as to the infrequency of the appositive infinitive and as to the inflection of the same. See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 75-77.

For reasons stated in the discussion of the origin of the appositive use of the infinitive in West-Saxon, it is probable that the idiom is partly native and partly foreign. See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 193.

C. As the Object of a Preposition

Aside from the inflected infinitive made up of the preposition *to* plus a dative of the verbal noun in *-ne,* which we regard as a unit and which, therefore, does not strictly fall under the above heading, I have found a few cases of the infinitive used as the Object of a Preposition. In all the examples except one, the infinitive is inflected. The examples in full are as follows:—

1. Uninflected:

L. I. 3.1: bodade *in* monnes *gecerræ* in him ðerh sunu dyde = predicans *in* hominis *redire* in se per filium faceret.

2. Inflected:

Mat. I. 21.10: gecunnedon *of* ðæm gæfel *uel* gyld cæseres *to seallanne* ofer inwurittena *uel* licnessa mið frasung gefælde = Temtantes *de* tributo caesaris *dando* supra inscribtionis *uel* imaginis interrogatione destruxit.

L. I. 9.16: gefrægn ðone weligo *from to byenna* lif ece ðiu æfterra onsuare unrod gecearf = Interrogans diues *de possidenda* uita aeterna secunda responsione tristis abscidit.

L. I. 10.8: costende *of* gæfel cæseres *to forgeldanne* penninges onwriting forcuom = Temtantes *de* tributo cæsaris *reddendo* denarii inscribtione conuincit.

L. I. 9.12: *to* symble *biddanne* geddung from widua setteð wraco from wiðeruarde his from unrehtwis doeme giwigende =

Ad semper *orandum* parabolam de uidua ponit ultionem de aduersario suo ab iniquo iudice postulante. Although we have the preposition *to* here plus a dative in *-ne,* the two words do not, I think, form a logical unit as in the ordinary infinitive with *to.*

Although some of the above examples are doubtful, some of the infinitives seem to me indisputably to be governed by a preposition. In all of the examples, the use of the preposition in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is in imitation of the idiom in the Latin original. Moreover, the differentiation between the uninflected infinitive and the inflected infinitive rests upon the differences in the Latin original: in the former the Latin has a simple infinitive; in the latter, a gerund or gerundive, usually the latter.

In West-Saxon no clear example was found of the infinitive as the object of a preposition: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 78.

In all three uses, the infinitive, whether uninflected or inflected, is active in sense as well as in form.

Concerning the Infinitive in Substantival Uses other than as subject or as object, in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 236-237.

IV. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH AUXILIARY VERBS

A. The Active Infinitive

As in West-Saxon, the uninflected infinitive as the Predicative Complement to Auxiliary Verbs is so frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as not to call for collection. Except in very rare cases, cited in Note 1 below, this infinitive is active in sense as well as in form.

Of the inflected infinitive as the predicative complement of auxiliary verbs I cite all the examples observed by me in the *Lindisfarne Gospels:—*

With **agan,** *owe, ought:*

Mat. 18.24[b]: gebroht wæs him enne seðe *ahte to geldanne* tea

ðusendo cræftas = oblatus est ei unus qui *debebat* decem milia talenta.

Mat. 18.28[a,b]: substantially as above.

L. 7.41: an *ahte to geldanne* penningas fif hund = unus *debebat* denarios quingentos.

L. 16.5: substantially as above.

With **dear(r)**, *dare:*

Mat. I. 1.9: godes wracco ðe ich (*sic*) *darr* huelc hwoego in aldum bocum *to eccanne uel* ic toecade, geswiga, gegema = sacrilegum qui *audeam* aliquid in ueteribus libris *addere,* mutare, corrigere.

With **willa**, *will, desire:*

Mat. 5.40: ðæm seðe *wil* ðec mið to dome geflitta & cyrtel *uel* hrægl ðin *to niomanne* forlet & hrægl *uel* hæcla *uel* bratt = illi qui *uult* tecum iudicio contendere et tunicam tuam *tollere* remitte et pallium.

As is evident, the inflected infinitive occurs chiefly with the dativa l verb, *agan,* as is true, also, in West-Saxon.

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the passive infinitive used predicatively with auxiliary verbs, I have found but two examples in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* namely, *Mat.* 26.9[a,b]: *mæhte* forðon ðis *wosa uel* were *biboht* in micil feh & *wosa sald* ðarfum = *potuit* enim istud *uenundari* multo pretio et *dari* pauperibus. The passive infinitive with auxiliary verbs in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in West-Saxon, is clearly due to Latin influence. See, too, Note 1 below.

For the Predicative Infinitive with Auxiliary Verbs in West-Saxon (where the situation is quite similar to that in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*), and in the kindred Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 79-88, 194, and 237-238.

NOTES

1. *Predicative Infinitives Active in Form, but Passive in Sense?*—In the following passages we seem to have predicative infinitives that are active in form but passive in sense:—*Mat.*

5.14[a]: ne *mæg* burug *uel* ceastra *gehyda uel gedeigla* ofer mor geseted = non *potest* ciuitas *abscondi* supra monte posita (Rushw.: *beon ahyded;* W. S.: *beon behyd*); *Mat.* 2.18[c]: ðæt wif woeap suna hire & *nalde froefra* forðon ne sint = rachel plorans filios suos et *noluit consulari* (*sic* for *consolari*) quia non sunt (Rushw.: *beon afroefred;* W. S.: *beon gefrefred*); *Mat.* 10.34[a]: *Nelleð* ge *gedoema uel ðæt ge se domad* forðon ic cuom to sendenne sibbe = *Nolite arbitrari* quia uenerim mittere pacem (the glossator mistaking the deponent, *arbitrari,* for the passive?).—See, also, Notes 5 and 6 below.

2. *Predicative Infinitive as Complement to Gesea, 'Seem.'*—In *Mat.* I. 3.1[b] we have a predicative infinitive as the complement to *gesea,* 'seem': ana ða ðoht gesegon gecerde *uel gevixla* = tantum quae sensum *uidebantur mutare.* [Professor Cook, in his *Glossary,* makes *gecerde* Ind. Pret. 3rd sing., but to me it seems a past participle, in the predicate nominative plural; and it may be that the glossator intended that the user of his book should put *gevixla* into the same participial form.]

3. *The Predicative Infinitive in a Series with Auxiliary Verbs.*—In *Mat.* I. 1.9[a,b,c], quoted on p. 119 above, we have a series of three infinitives the first of which is inflected, but the others are not. On the other hand, in *Mat.* 5.40, quoted on p. 119 above, we have a series of two infinitives the first of which is uninflected, but the second, contrary to the general rule, is inflected.

4. *An Alternative Rendering of a Latin Deponent Infinitive by either an Active Infinitive or by a Passive Subjunctive* is given in *Mat.* 10.34[a], quoted above in Note 1.

5. *An Abortive Attempt at Rendering a Latin Passive Infinitive Complementary to "Debeo"* is found in *Mat.* 3.14: cueð ic from ðe *rehtra is gefulwia* = dicens ego a te *debeo baptizari* (Rushw.: cweðende ic *sceal* from ðe *beon uel wesa deped uel fullwihted;* W. S.: cwæð: Ic *sceal* fram ðe *beon gefullod*).

6. *The Adverbial Use of the Auxiliary "Mæg"* occurs in the phrase *eaðe mæg* (*mæge, mæhte*), as in *L.* 21.34: behaldað ðonne iuih *eaðe mæge uel* ðætte ne sie ahefigad hearto iuero = Attendite autem uobis *ne forte* grauentur corda sua (Rushw.: *eaða mæge;* W. S.: *ðe læs*); *Mat.* 11.23 *eaða mæhte uel eaðe mæge* were wungiende *uel* ðætte hia gewunadon wið ðonne ondueard dæg *uel* ðiosne ondueard dæge = *forte* mansissent usque in hunc diem (Rushw.: *wen;* W. S.: *witodlice*). Unintelligible to me is the use of this phrase in *Mat.* 12.33: gif ec soðlic from wæstm treo oncnaua *eaða mæg* = si quidem ex fructu arbor agnoscitur (Rushw.: *forðon ðe* of westem *bið* treow *ongeten;* W. S.: Witodlice be ðam wæstmme *byð* ðæt treow *oncnawen*). [In his marginal note to this passage, Skeat says of *eaða mæg:* "intended as a further gloss to si quidem." I am inclined, however, to think that *mæg* is here a verb, not, as classified by Professors Cook and Skeat, an adverb; and that *oncnaua* is the infinitive complement of *mæg,* and is here passive in sense, though active in form, because of the Latin passive, *agnoscitur.*]

7. *The Uninflected Infinitive after "Agan."*—In his *Syntax im Poema Morale,* a Breslau dissertation of 1914, p. 33, Dr. Walter Preusler declares that the uninflected infinitive is not found in Anglo-Saxon after *agan,* 'owe,' 'ought.' Four examples of this construction, however, had been recorded by me in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 81; but that monograph had appeared too recently to be accessible to Dr. Preusler.

V. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH VERBS OF MOTION AND OF REST OTHER THAN "WUTUN"

Of the Predicative Infinitive with Verbs of Motion, as in the *Martyrology* 26.10 (*culfre com fleogan* of heofonum ond gesæt ofer his heafde, 'the dove came flying from heaven,' etc.), in which the infinitive, instead of denoting purpose, seems equivalent, in modern English, to a predicative present participle, no example has been found in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Nor was

an example of this construction found in the *West-Saxon Gospels.* The idiom is found frequently in Anglo-Saxon poetry and occasionally in the prose.

Of a similar predicative use of the infinitive after Verbs of Rest, as in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* 512. 417 (ðær ðæt scræf wæs tomiddes ðe ða seofon halgan *lagon* inne *slapan,* 'where the cave was in which the seven saints lay sleeping'), no example occurs either in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* or in the *West-Saxon Gospels.* The idiom is very rare in Anglo-Saxon.

Concerning each of these two idioms in West-Saxon and in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 89-92, 194-199, and 238-239. Compare, too, Dr. J. H. Kern's *De met het Participium Praeteriti Omschreven Werkwoordsvormen in 't Nederlands,* Amsterdam, 1912, §§ 61 and 329, and the references there given to Stoett; also van Helten [4], pp. 230-232.

VI. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH "WUTUN" [18]

A. The Active Infinitive

Of the active infinitive as Predicative Complement to *Wutun,* 'let,' about seven examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* The infinitive is always uninflected, and is active in sense as well as in form.

The examples in full are as follows:—

ga(geonga), *go* (4):

Mat. 26.46: *wutum geonga* = *eamus.* So: *Mk.* 1.38, 14.42; *J.* 14.31.

gesea, *see* (1):

Mat. 27.49[a]: *wutun* we *gesea* hweðer cyme = *uideamus* an ueniat.

ofsla, *slay, kill* (2):

Mk. 12.7: cymes *wutum* we ofsla hine = uenite *occidamus* eum;—*L.* 20.14: *wutun ofslæ* hine = *occidamus* illum.

In each of these examples *wutun* plus the infinitive translates

[18] The regular Lindisfarne form is either *wutum* or *wutun.*

a Latin subjunctive. In one example, *Mk.* 12.7, both in the Latin and in the Northumbrian gloss, an adhortative (*uenite* = *cymes*) precedes *wutun*.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

The paucity of examples of the Predicative Infinitive with *Wutun* makes it unwise to dogmatize about the origin of the idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. But the evidence seems to support the theory that the idiom in West-Saxon was native, but was somewhat helped on by the occurrence of the subjunctive in the Latin original. See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, pp. 93-96, 199-200; and for this idiom in Old Saxon, p. 239 of the same.

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the passive infinitive as the predicative complement of *wutun* I have found no example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*.

Note. An Alternation of the Analytic "Wutun" Plus an Infinitive with the Synthetic Subjunctive is found twice: *Mk.* 1.38: *gæ we uel wutum geonga* = *eamus;* similarly *Mk.* 14.42.

VII. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH "BIA(N)" ("WOSA")

A. The Infinitive Denotes Necessity or Obligation

The Predicative Infinitive with *Bia(n)* (*Wosa*) Denoting Necessity or Obligation in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* seems to me always passive in sense, as in *L.* I. 11.1: ðætte neh eostro *is to redenne* = Quod propre pascha *legendum est.* In West-Saxon, however, this infinitive is occasionally active in sense. Without exception the infinitive is inflected.

I cite all the examples found, arranged alphabetically (21, of which 17 are in the "Introductions"):—

ahoa, *crucify* (1): *J.* (1): 19.16.

awrita, *write* (1): *J.* (1): 21.25.

behalda (bi-), *hold, guard against* (3) : *Mat.* (2) : I. 17.15[b]; I. 20.2.—*L.* (1) : I. 2.10.

geafa, *give* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 1.12.

gelefa, *believe* (1) : *J.* (1) : I. 4.2[b].

reda, *read* (3) : *L.* (1) : I. 11.1.—*J.* (2) : I. 4.19; I. 5.8[a].

sella, *give* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 17.13[b] (in which *sellende* is for *sellenne* without *to?*).

senda, *send, put* (1) : *L.* (1) : 5.38.

setta, *set, place* (1) : *Mk.* (1) : I. 3.5[a].

soeca, *seek* (5) : *Mat.* (4) : I. 1.12; I. 2.11; I. 4.4[a]; I. 9.19. —*Mk.* (1) I. 4.8[b].

swiga (suiga), *keep silent* (1) : *Mat.* (1) : I. 15.5.

tosoeca, *seek, return* (Latin *referre*) (1) : *L.* (1) : I. 9.9[a] (*woero tosæccenne;* perhaps should be put under the simplex, *soeca*).

wundriga, *wonder, admire* (1) : *J.* (1) : 9.30.

Of these twenty-one examples, fifteen translate Latin gerundives (of which one is preceded by *ad*), a correspondent which is quite common in West-Saxon, also, and which in both dialects often accounts for the use of the inflected infinitive of necessity. The other Latin correspondents are: an appositive participle, passive, 1; an objective infinitive, active, 1; a present passive infinitive, 1; a subjunctive passive, 1; a substantival participle, present, 1; an adjective in *-bilis*, 1.

B. The Infinitive Denotes Futurity

Of the Infinitive Denoting Futurity, I have found no clear example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*, though it occurs several times in West-Saxon. Where the predicative infinitive with *beon* (*wesan*) denoting Futurity is found in the *West-Saxon Gospels*, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* use (1) a predicate participle (usually present, but occasionally past) or (2) a predicate adjective or (3) a predicative verbal noun:—

(1) *Mat.* 11.3: W. S., Eart ðu ðe *to cumenne eart?* = Lind., arð ðu seðe *tocymende wæs uel is?* = tu es qui *uenturus es?*

Similarly: *Mat.* 16.27; *L.* 7.19, 20; *L.* 10.1; *J.* 1.15.—*L.* 22.23: W. S., *to donne wære* = Lind., *doend were* = *facturus esset.*

L. 9.31: W. S., his gewitendnesse ðe he *to gefyllende* (= *gefyllenne?*) *wæs* on hierusalem = Lind., tofær his ðone (*sic*) *scealde gefylled wosa uel* wæs in h. = excessum eius quem *completurus erat* in h.—*Mat.* 17.12: W. S., swa *ys* mannes sunu eac fram him *to ðrowigenne* = Lind., sunu monnes *geðrowed bið* from him = et filius hominis *passurus est* ab eis. [Skeat in a marginal note to *geðrowed:* "Ms. *geðrowend* altered to *geðrowed.*"]

(2) *Mat.* 11.14: W. S., he ys helias ðe *to cumenne ys* = Lind., ðe is —[= blank] seðe *toueard wæs* = ipse est helias qui *uenturus est.*

(3) *L.* 24.21: W. S., we hopedon ðæt he *to alysenne wære* israhel = Lind., woe . . . gehyhton ðætte he *were eftlesing* israeles = nos autem sperabamus quia ipse *esset redemturus* israhel.

C. The Infinitive Denotes Purpose

Of the inflected infinitive with *bia(n)* (*wosa*) denoting Purpose, only two examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* one of which is doubtful:—*L.* I. 7.9^{b}: ðæt lehtfæt cuoeðende ne *were* under mitte *to gesettanne* = *Lucernam* dicens non *esse* sub modio *poni* (or may denote Necessity); *L.* 5.17: mægen *wæs* drihtnes to *hælenne* hia = uirtus *erat* domini *ad sanandum* eos. The same idiom is found in the West-Saxon version of the second passage. In the first example, the infinitive, though active in form, is passive in sense, and translates a Latin passive infinitive; in the second example, it is active in sense as well as in form, and translates a Latin gerund that is active in sense.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

With the exceptions already noted, the situation with respect to the Inflected Infinitive of Necessity is substantially the same in West-Saxon as in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* The probability

is that, when denoting necessity or purpose, the inflected infinitive with *bia(n)* (*wosa*) was suggested by the Latin. See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 97-106 and 200-203, for this idiom in West-Saxon, and pp. 239-240 for this construction in the other Germanic languages.

NOTES

1. *An Inflected Infinitive without "To"* occurs in *Mat.* I. 17.13^{b}: halig hundum & bergum ne *is sellende* (for *sellenne?*) . . . foregemercade *uel* getachte = Sanctum canibus porcisque non *dandum* . . . praefigit. It is possible, of course, that the glossator purposely wrote the participle here (*sellende*) instead of the inflected infinitive (*sellenne*) without *to.* See A above; also "the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction," below, in Section xv.

2. *An Inflected Infinitive of Necessity Alternates with a Past Participle* in *J.* 19.16: ðætte *uoere ahoen uel to ahoanne* = ut *crucifigeretur.*

3. *An Inflected Infinitive of Necessity Alternates with an Adjective* in *J.* 9.30: in ðis forðon *to uundranne uel uundorlice is* = in hoc enim *mirabile est.* Professor Cook considers *uundorlice* an adverb here, but it seems better to construe it as an adjective with an improper ending: compare Carpenter, *l. c.,* § 162.

VIII. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH ACCUSATIVE SUBJECT

The active infinitive as the Quasi-Predicate of an Accusative Subject is more commonly uninflected in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as in the West-Saxon, but it is found inflected much more frequently in the former than in the latter. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* we have about 38 (65 including the "Introductions") examples of the uninflected predicative infinitive to about 4 (41 including the "Introductions") examples of the inflected infinitive, in objective clauses; while the *West-Saxon Gospels* has 44 and 0 respectively. In subjective clauses, the predi-

cative infinitive (uninflected in all instances but 2) is likewise more common in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in the West-Saxon, about 38 examples occurring in the former to 7 in the latter.

Of the strictly passive infinitive (that is, of the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus the past participle) I have found no clear example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* At times, however, the active infinitive, whether uninflected or inflected (especially the latter), is passive in sense. But the voice of the predicative infinitive is too complicated for collective treatment, and must be discussed piece-meal in the several subsections of this division of my study.

I. As Object

A. The Active Infinitive

1. *Uninflected*

The uninflected active infinitive with accusative subject, in object clauses, seems to me almost exclusively active in sense as well as in form. Possibly the infinitive is passive in sense in the two following passages, in each of which it translates a Latin passive infinitive:—*Mat.* 23.7 lufað . . . groetengo in sprec & *hia ceiga uel hia genemna* from monnum laruas = *amant* . . . et salutationes in foro et *uocari* ab hominibus rabbi; *Mat.* 27.21: *hueðer* ne *wallað* gie iwh ðara twoege *forleta?* = *quem uultis* uobis de duobus *dimitti?* (Rushw.: *hwæðer* willað ge eow ðara twegra *forleten beon;* W. S.; *Hwæðerne wylle* ge ðæt ic *forgyfe* eow of ðisum twam?). But in the two following examples, in which the Latin original has a predicative passive infinitive, the Lindisfarne infinitive is active in sense as well as in form:—*L.* I. 9.15[a]: ða lytlo from him *hia adrifa forebead* = *Paruulos* a se *uetari prohibens;* L. 18.40: *geheht hine tolæda* hine = *iussit illum adduci* se (Rushw.: *heht hine læda* to him; W. S.: *het hine lædan* to him). Some hold, however, that, after verbs of commanding and of causing, we sometimes have a predicative infinitive that, though active in form, is passive in

sense. The grounds for the active interpretation have been given in Section II, on "the Objective Infinitive," pp. 102-103 above; where I have stated that to me the infinitive in examples of the sort there cited seems, not predicative, but objective, and the accompanying accusative, not subjective, but objective.

The groups of verbs with which we find the accusative-with-infinitive construction are much the same as in West-Saxon, but naturally the distribution within the groups differs appreciably. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the predicative infinitive with accusative subject is found:—

I. Occasionally with these Verbs[19] of Commanding (10):
forbeada (2), *forbid.*
gebidda (1), *bid, request.*
gehata (4), *order, command.*
hata (3), *order, command.*

II. Oftenest with these Verbs of Causing and of Permitting (24):
doa (3), *do, cause.*
forgeafa (1): *grant, allow.*
forleta (5): *let, allow.*
gedoa (3), *do, cause.*
gelefa (2), *allow.*
geðreaga (1), *force, compel.*
gewyrca (1), *make, cause.*
lefa (1), *allow.*
leta (4), *let, allow.*
ondeta (1), usually *confess,* but here *allow.*
ðerhgelefa (1), *permit.*
wyrca (1), *make, cause.*

III. Occasionally with these Verbs of Sense Percepti n (4):
gesea (3), *see.*
sea (1), *see.*

[19] In these lists the figure in parenthesis indicates the number of occurrences of each verb with this construction.

IV. Occasionally with these Verbs of Mental Perception (12):

ædeawa (1), *show.*
geeawa (1), *show.*
gefæstniga (1), *confirm.*
geondwearda (1), *respond.*
getrymma (4), *affirm, confirm* (belongs partly under V.).
læra (2), *teach.*
ongeatta (1), *understand, know.*
woena (1), *hope.*

V. Occasionally with these Verbs of Declaring (10):

cuoeða (9), *say, declare.*
onsacca (1), *deny.*

VI. Rarely with these Other Verbs (5):

lufiga (1), *love.*
willa (4), *wish, desire.*

As this idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is substantially identical with the corresponding one in West-Saxon, I give here only a few examples:—

Mat. 19.14: nallas ge *hia forbeada* to me *cyme* = nolite *eos prohibere* ad me *uenire.*—*Mat.* 14.28: *haat meh gecumæ* to ðe = *iube me uenire* ad te.

Mat. 5.45: *sunna* his *arise doeð* = *solem* suum *oriri facit.*—*Mat.* 13.30ª: *forletas egðer uel boege gewæxe* = *sinite utraque crescere.*

Mk. 13.29: miððy gie *geseas ðas wosa* = cum *uideritis hæc fieri.*—*L.* 24.39: bano ne hæfeð suæ *mec* gie *seas habba* = ossa non habet sicut *me uidetis habere.*

Mat. I. 17.15ª: *monige . . . inngae getrymes* = *multos . . . introire testatur.*—*Mat.* 28.20ᵇ: *lærende hia halda* alle = *docentes eos seruare* omnia.

J. I. 6.8: *latzarum . . . slepe cuoeð* = *Lazarum . . . dormire dicit.*—*Mat.* I. 6.17: ða ðe *onsaccas* —(= blank) in lic-

homa *gecomae* = *negant christum* in carne *uenisse* (*christum*, being a proper noun, is not glossed).

L. 19.27: ðaðe ne *waldon mec rixage* = qui *noluerunt me regnare.*

The following is a complete list of the verbs followed by the active uninflected infinitive used as the Predicate of an Accusative Subject, in objective clauses (65, of which 27 are in the "Introductions"):—

ædeawa, *show* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.16.

cwoeða, *say, declare* (9): *Mat.* (3): I. 17.18; I. 18.15[a]; I. 19.18.—*Mk.* (1): I. 3.5[c].—*L.* (3): I. 7.5[b]; 11.18; 24.23[b].—*J.* (2): I. 4.18; I. 6.8.

doa, *do, cause* (3): *Mat.* (2): 5.45; 21.7.—*L.* (1): 12.37[b].

forbeada, *forbid, prohibit* (2): *Mat.* (1): 19.14.—*L.* (1): I. 9.15[a].

forgeafa, *grant, allow* (1): *Mk.* (1): 7.12.

forleta, *let, permit* (5): *Mat.* (3): 8.21[a,b]; 13.30[a].—*L.* (1): 10.40.—*J.* (1): 18.8.

gebidda, *bid, request* (1): *L.* (1): 5.3.

gedoa, *do, cause* (3): *Mat.* (1): 5.33.—*Mk.* (1): 6.39.—*L.* (1): 24.28.

geeawa, *show, demonstrate* (1): *L.* (1): I. 2.17.

gefæstniga, *confirm* (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.19[b].

gehata, *order, command* (4): *Mat.* (2): 14.22[a,b].—*L.* (1): 18.40.—*J.* (1): I. 6.9[a].

gelefa, *allow, permit* (2): *L.* (2): I. 5.20; 8.51.

geondwearda, *respond* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.14[a].

gesea, *see* (3): *Mk.* (2): 7.2; 13.29.—*L.* (1): 13.28.

getrymma, *affirm, confirm* (4): *Mat.* (1): I. 17.15[a].—*L.* (1): I. 6.13[c].—*J.* (2): I. 4.2[c]; I. 7.9[b].

geðreaga, *force, compel* (1): *Mk.* (1): 6.45.

gewyrca, *make, compel* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 1.1.

hata, *order, command* (3): *Mat.* (1): 14.28.—*Mk.* (2): I. 5.9[c,d].

læra, *teach, instruct* (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 20.5[b]; 28.20[b].

lefa, *allow, permit* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.6.

leta, *let, allow* (4): *Mat.* (1): 23.13.—*Mk.* (1): 10.14.—*L.* (1): 18.16.—*J.* (1): 11.44[b].

lufiga, *love* (1): *Mat.* (1): 23.7.

ondeta, usually *confess,* but here *allow* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 3.1[c] (*ondetaþ* = *pateremur*).

ongeatta, *understand, know* (1): *L.* (1): I. 11.8[c].

onsacca, *deny* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 6.17.

sea, *see* (1): *L.* (1): 24.39.

þerhgelefa, *permit* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.6[b].

willa, *will, desire* (4): *Mat.* (1): 27.21.—*L.* (1): 19.27.—*J.* (2): 21.22, 23.

woena, *ween, think* (1): *L.* (1): 8.18.

wyrca, *make, cause* (1): *L.* (1): 5.34.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

The Latin correspondents of the uninflected Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject are as follows: an accusative with an active infinitive, 58; with a deponent infinitive, 3; with a passive infinitive, 3 (2 present; 1 perfect); and with a future participle, 1. The completeness of the correspondence here between the Latin original and the Northumbrian gloss would lead one to suspect more or less of Latin influence, I believe. That the native trend in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is decidedly against the accusative-with-infinitive construction is indicated by this fact: although in 64 instances the Latin accusative-with-infinitive construction is retained in the Northumbrian gloss, in 130 instances this Latin idiom is rendered otherwise than by a predicative infinitive (uninflected or inflected) with accusative subject.

Possibly an inspection of the list of verbs after which this Latin idiom is avoided may help us to attain more specific results as to the origin of the accusative-with-infinitive construction in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Accordingly I give in parallel columns an alphabetical list of the verbs after which in these Gospels the accusative-with-infinitive construction of the Latin original is retained or avoided:—

	Retained:	Avoided:
ædeawa, 'show'	1	2
æteawa, 'show'		3
awrita, 'write,' 'express'		2
bebeada, 'command'		2
ceiga, 'call,' 'exclaim'		2
cuoeða, 'say,' 'declare'	9	49
doa, 'do,' 'cause'	3	2
doema, 'judge'		1
forbeada, 'forbid,' 'prohibit'	2	1
forecuoeða, 'prophesy'		3
foregehata, 'promise'		1
foresægca, 'predict'		1
forgeafa, 'grant,' 'allow'	1	
forleta, 'let,' 'permit'	5	
gebidda, 'bid,' 'request'	1	
gecyða, 'make known'		3
gedoa, 'do,' 'cause'	3	1
geeawa, 'show,' 'demonstrate'	1	
gefæstniga, 'confirm'	1	3
gehata, 'order,' 'command'	4	6
gehata, 'promise'		2
gelæra, 'teach'		2
gelecniga, 'take care'		1
gelefa, 'allow'	2	
gemerciga, 'signify'		1
geniðriga, 'humiliate'		1
geondswariga, 'respond'		1
geondwearda, 'respond'	1	4
gesea, 'see'	3	5
gesweriga, 'swear'		1
getrymma, 'affirm,' 'confirm'	4	1
geðreaga, 'force,' 'compel'	1	
gewyrca, 'make,' 'compel'	1	1
hata, 'order,' 'command'	3	2
læra, 'teach,' 'instruct'	2	4

	Retained:	Avoided:
lefa, 'allow,' 'permit'	1	
leta, 'let,' 'allow'	4	1
ondeta, usually 'confess,' but here 'allow'	1	
ondswariga, 'answer'		1
ongeatta, 'understand'	1	
onsæcca, 'deny'	1	1
sægca, 'say,' 'declare,'		1
sea, 'see'	1	
soeca, 'seek'		2
soðiga, 'attest,' 'prove'		1
spreca, 'speak'		2
todoema, 'judge'		1
ðerhgelefa, 'permit'	1	
willa (*ne willa*), 'will,' 'wish' ('will not,' 'wish not')	4	1
wita, 'know'		2
woena, 'think'	1	3
wyrca, 'make,' 'cause'	1	1

This list will not enable us to decide as to the origin of the accusative-with-infinitive construction with each word, but it makes highly probable, I think, several general conclusions. The idiom was probably native with a few verbs (1) of Commanding (*gehata, hata*), (2) of Causing and Permitting (*doa, gedoa, gewyrca(?), wyrca(?), forgeafa, forleta, gelefa, lefa, leta, ðerhgelefa*), (3) of Sense Perception (*gesea, sea*), (4) of Mental Perception (*getrymma*), and (5) of Inclination and of Will (*willa*(?)). The idiom was probably of foreign (Latin) origin with all verbs of Declaring, for, although this construction is found 9 times after *cuoeða,* it is avoided 49 times therewith and several times with other verbs of declaring (*ceiga, forecuoeða, foresægca, gemerciga, geondswariga, geondwearda, ondswariga, sægca, spreca*). Moreover, the idiom is avoided, also, with this verb of Commanding (*bebeada*), and with sev-

eral verbs of Mental Perception (*æteawa, awrita, doema, foregehata* ('promise'), *gecyða, gefæstniga, gehata* ('promise'), *gelæra, gelecniga, geniðriga, gesweriga, soeca, soðiga, todoema, wita, woena*). This situation with reference to the accusative-with-infinitive construction in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is remarkably similar to that in West-Saxon, as may be seen by comparing my summary concerning the origin of this idiom in the latter, in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 208, which is too long for quotation here. However, the accusative-with-infinitive construction is more frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* after verbs of declaring than in West-Saxon, nine examples occurring in the former to only five in the whole of West-Saxon.

II. INFLECTED

About 41 examples (all but four in the "Introductions") have been found of the inflected infinitive used as the Predicate of a Subject Accusative, in objective clauses, against less than a dozen clear examples in the whole of West-Saxon.

As indicated below, more frequently than not the Lindisfarne inflected infinitive here is passive in sense, a fact explained by the further fact that in such instances it usually translates a Latin passive gerundive without *esse,* as in *Mat.* I. 20.8^{b}: *cweð cynn* ðæt mið gebed & mið fæstern *to fordrifanne* = *ait* genus illud oratione ieiunioque *pellendum.* This idiom, both in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and in the Latin original, may be considered an elliptical form of the predicative infinitive of necessity with the verb *bia(n)* (*wosa*), the ellipsis (of *esse*) being patent in the Latin. Compare, in Section xv below, what is said of the "the Elliptical-Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction," which in one of its phases is passive in sense.

I give in full the examples of the inflected infinitive as Predicate of an Accusative Subject, in alphabetic sequence of the governing verb (41, all but four in the "Introductions"):—

ACTIVE IN FORM AND IN SENSE

(6, of which 3 are in the "Introductions")

cuoeða, *say, declare* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.13: *cuoeð niðriendo* godra woruldra hundteantigsiða monigfallice mið oehtnissum eft *to onfoenne* = *ait contemtores* bonorum saecularium centuplum cum persecutionibus *recepturus* (for *recepturos?*).

foresæcga, *announce, declare* (1): *J.* (1): I. 6.4: he uere cuoeð duru & hiorde scipa fore ðæm he his sauel ðæt he ualde gesete & oðero scip *to gelædanne foresægde* = seque dicit ostium et pastorem ouium pro quibus *se* suam animam positurum et alias oues *adducturum* pronuntiat (with accusative subject to be supplied in the Old English).

forleta, *allow, let* (1): *Mat.* (1): 8.22: fylge meh & *forlet* ða *deado to bebyrgenne* ða deado hiora = sequere me et *dimitte mortuos sepelire* mortuos suos.

lefa, *allow, permit* (2): *Mk.* (2): I. 3.6: *diowles* fordraf gegeonga *uel to geonganne lefde* in bergum = *demones* eiciens *ire concessit* in porcos; 1.34[b]: nalde leta spreca hia *uel* ne *lefde hia to spreccanne* = non *sinebat loqui* ea (or Objective?).

leta, *let, allow* (1): *Mk.* (1): 5.37: ne *leort* ænigne *monno to fylgenne* hine = non *admisit quemquam sequi* se.

ACTIVE IN FORM, BUT PASSIVE IN SENSE

(35, of which 34 are in the "Introductions")

beada, *order, command* (2): *L.* (2): I. 10.19[a,b]: *to wæccenne bead & to biddanne* = *uigilandum praecipit* et *orandum* (with the accusative subject implied in both Old English and Latin. Or the infinitive may be considered purely Objective?).

bebeada, *order, command* (3): *L.* (3): I. 5.8[a,b]; I. 7.15.

cuoeða, *say, declare* (3): *Mat.* (2): I. 20.8[b]: *cweð cynn* ðæt mið gebed & mið fæstern *to fordrifenne* = *ait genus* illud oratione ieiunioque *pellendum;* 16.12.—*L.* (1): I. 5.17[a].

efnegefestniga, *conclude, assure* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 21.7.

forecuoeða, *predict, assert* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.15: *ymbsel-*

lenne from here *hierusalem . . . forecuoeð* = *circumdandam* ab exercitu *hierusalem . . . praedicit.*

foregehata, *declare, promise* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 16.13[b].

foresæcga, *declare, urge* (3): *Mat.* (1): I. 21.20[b]: *to wæccenne foresægde* = *Uigilandum praedicit* (with accusative subject implied? or Objective purely?).—*L.* (2): I. 9.11, 12.

gebecniga, *signify, indicate* (1): *J.* (1): I. 7.16: ða ilca & from feder *to lufanne gebecnas* = *quos* a patre *amari significans.*

gehata, *order, urge* (6): *Mat.* (5): I. 16.15[b]; I. 17.1(?): I. 17.5[c]; I. 21.15; I. 21.20[a].—*Mk.* (1): I. 3.20.

getrymma, *affirm* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 17.5[a].

hata, *order, command* (3): *Mat.* (1): I. 20.11 (*forhycganne* without *to*).—*L.* (2): I. 7.16, 17.

læra, *teach, instruct* (9): *Mat.* I. 17.6: ða *allmissa laeras* deiglige *to doanne* = *Aelemosynam docet* in abscondito *faciendam;* I. 17.8[b,c]; I. 17.13[a].—*Mk.* (1): I. 5.8.—*L.* (3): I. 8.10; I. 9.14[b,c].—*J.* (1): I. 7.12.

merciga, *signify, indicate* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.15[b].

sæcga, *say, declare* (1): *J.* (1): I. 8.2: *saegeð underniomanne lichoma* of byrgenne = *nuntiat sublatum corpus de monumento.*

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

In a few instances (*a*) (as in *Mk.* I. 3.6 and 1.34[b], quoted on p. 135 above), the inflection of the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject seems to be due to the proximity of the infinitive to a verb of double regimen (*lefa*) in the Northumbrian.[20] But in most instances the inflection is due to the influence of the Latin original, the Northumbrian inflected infinitive corresponding to Latin locutions that in West-Saxon, also, usually cause inflection, though not in the predicative use: the accusative-with-infinitive construction in the Latin having (*b*) a future active participle (2) or (*c*) a gerundive (32),

[20] In each of these passages both the uninflected infinitive and the inflected infinitive are given as glosses.

the latter usually with the ellipsis of *esse*. The other Latin correspondents are: the accusative-with-infinitive construction having a present active infinitive (2), a deponent infinitive (2), a present passive infinitive (2), and a perfect passive infinitive (1). The influence of the Latin gerundial and future participle constructions is stronger in the Northumbrian than in the West-Saxon, in which latter only a few examples occur of the inflected infinitive used predicatively with a subject accusative (scarcely a dozen clear examples). Moreover, as stated above, p. 134, the voice of the inflected predicative infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is determined largely by the nature of its Latin original.

For this idiom in West-Saxon and in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 118-119, 213, and 247-248.

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the sericly passive infinitive (that is, of the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus the perfect participle), as stated incidentally at the beginning of this chapter, I have found no clear example. But, as shown in Section A, often an inflected infinitive that is active in form is passive in sense, and very rarely an uninflected infinitive seems to be passive in sense.

II. As Subject

A. The Active Infinitive

1. uninflected

In the subjective use, the uninflected Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject is much more frequent in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in West-Saxon, there being 36 examples (of which six are in the "Introductions") in the former to seven examples in the latter (all in the *West-Saxon Gospels*). In five of these 36 examples, the infinitive is the subject of a passive verb.

In most instances here the infinitive is active in sense as in

form. But in a few examples, indicated below, the Lindisfarne infinitive, though active in form, translates a Latin passive infinitive, and appears itself to be passive in sense. See above, p. 134.

I give in full the examples of the uninflected Predicative Infinitive with Subject Accusative, in alphabetic sequence of the verb of which the infinitive phrase is the subject (36 examples, of which six are in the "Introductions"):—

arisa, *be fitting* (4): *L.* (4): 9.22[a,b,c,d]: cuoeð ðætte *ariseð sunu* monnes feolo *uel* micelo *geðolia uel geðrowia* & *forcumma* from aldum *uel* from ðæm ældestum & aldormonnum sacerda & uðwutum & *ofslaa uel* ðætte se ofslægen & ðe ðirddan ðæg (*sic*) *arisa* = dicens quia *oportet filium* hominis multa *pati* et *reprobari* a senioribus et principibus sacerdotum et scribis et *occidi* et tertia die *resurgere*. Two of these infinitives, though active in form, translate Latin passive infinitives, and appear to be passive in sense. In these two instances, the W.S. *Luke* has a passive subjunctive (*beo aworpen*) and a passive infinitive (*beon ofslegen*). The Rushworth *Luke* has one appositive participle (*forcumen*) and three finite verbs.

bia(n) (wosa), *be,* plus an adjective (occasionally a noun) (20):—

— **eaðor (eaður),** *easier* (3): *Mat.* (2): 19.24[a,b]: *eaður is camel* ðerh ðyril nedles *oferfœra* ðon ðe *wlonca ingeonga* in rice heofna = *facilius est camelum* per foramen acus *transire* quam *diuitem intrare* in regnum caelorum. [Professor Cook makes *wlonca* nominative here, although he considers *ingeonga* an infinitive. I think that *wlonca* is a weak accusative, and that *ðe,* though nominative in form, is accusative in function: see Carpenter, *l. c.,* §§ 560 and 675.] *Mk.* (1): 10.25.

— **gedoefenlic (gedæfenlic),** *fitting* (1): *J.* (1): I. 4.2[a]: *gedoefenlic is* ðætte gewox *hine* hueðre *lytlige* = *dicitur iesum . . . oportere* crescere *se* autem *minui.*

— **god,** *good* (2): *Mat.* (2): 18.8[a,c]: *god uel* betra *ðe* is to life *ingae* unhal *uel* halt ðon tua honda *uel* tuoege foet hæb-

bende *uel* hæbbe *sende* in fyr ece = *bonum* tibi *est* ad uitam *ingredi* debilem uel clodum quam duas manus uel duos pedes habentem *mitti* in ignem aeternum (or Subjective?) Cf. the comments on *arisa* above.

— **rehtlic,** *right, proper* (11): *Mat.* (7): 16.21[a,b,c,d]: forðon *rehtlic is hine uel* he *gegæ* hierusalem & feolo *geðolega* from aldrum & uuðuttum & aldormonnum ðara sacerda & *ofslæ* & ðe ðirda dæg *eftarisa* = quia *oporteret eum ire* hierosolymam et multa *pati* a senioribus et scribis et principibus sacerdotum et *occidi* et tertia die *resurgere* (cf. the comments on *arisa* above); 17.10[b]; 24.6; 25.27.—*Mk.* (4): 8.31[b,c,d,e].

— **sel,** *happy, fortunate* (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.35: ðeh ðe *seel sie me suelta* ðec wið = etiamsi *oportuerit me mori* tecum.

— **werc,** *work* (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 1.5, 6(?).

gedæfniga, *be fitting* (3): *L.* (1): 4.43: cuoeð forðon & oðrum ceastrum *gedæfneð mec bodia* = ait quia et aliis ciuitatibus *oportet me euangelizare.*—*J.* (2): 10.16; 20.9.

gerisa (gehrisa), *be fitting* (3): *L.* (3): 13.33[a] (or Subjective only?); 24.26[a,b]: ahne ðas *geras geðrouia crist* & on ða wisa *ingeonga* in wuldre his? = nonne haec *oportuit pati christum* et ita *intrare* in gloriam suam? [W. S.: hu ne *gebyrede criste* ðas ðing *ðoligean* & swa on his wuldor *gan,* in which we have the normal West-Saxon rendering of the Latin accusative-with-infinitive construction as subject by the subjective infinitive with a dative dependent on the main verb.]

nioma (1), usually transitive and meaning *take,* but here probably intransitive and meaning *be fitting or possible* (as is probably true also of its Latin original, *capit*): soð hueðre gehriseð *uel* gedæfneð me todæg & tomerne & ðæm æfterfylgende geonga forðon ne *nimeð witge losia* buta hierusalem = uerumtamen oportet me hodie et cras et sequenti ambulare quia non *capit prophetam perire* extra hierusalem (Rushw.: *ibidem;* W. S.: Ðeahhwæðere me bebyreð todæg & tomorhgen & ðy æfteran dæge gan, forðam ðe ne *gebyreð* ðæt *se witega forwurðe* butan hierusalem. [Although I do not find in any of the glossaries, general or special, the definition here suggested

for *nioma,* for several reasons I feel confident that the definition is substantially correct. (1) The translation suggested is in harmony with the West-Saxon version. (2) It is based upon a well-authenticated use of *capio,* as a reference to the Latin dictionaries will show. And (3) it harmonizes in sense with the variant readings for *non capit* (*inpossibile est* and *non est possibile*) given in Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine,* p. 409.]

In the following five examples, the infinitive phrase is the subject of the passive of the verb indicated:—

(ge)cuoeða, *say, declare* (1): *J.* (1): I. 4.1[b]: *is gecuoeden ðone hælend fulguge* = *dicitur iesum baptizare.*

gedæfniga, *be fitting* (2): J. (2): 4.24: gaast is god & *ða* forðon geuorðias hine in gast & soðfæstnisse *is gedæfned uorðia* = spiritus est deus et *eos* quia adorant eum in spiritu et ueritate *oportet adorare;* 13.14.

(ge)hata, *promise* (2): *J.* (2): I. 7.8[a,b]: *hine* sib *gesealla* him & sib *forleta gehaten bið uel* is = *s*eque pacem *dare* eis pacemque *relinquere pollicetur.*

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

In all of the aforementioned examples of the uninflected Predicative Infinitive except one (*J.* 13.14), the accusative-with-infinitive phrase translates the same idiom of the Latin original; in the exceptional instance, the Latin has a complementary infinitive. Although this idiom of the Latin is avoided about 29 times in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the influence of the Latin accusative-with-infinitive phrase as subject is much stronger in Northumbrian than in West-Saxon, in which latter the idiom is so generally avoided that by most Old English scholars the idiom has been declared non-existent in West-Saxon. As already indicated, this is an error; but, as was incidentally stated above, p. 139, under *gerisa,* the normal West-Saxon (and normal Germanic) rendering of the Latin subjective accusative-with-infinitive construction is the subjective infinitive (either uninflected or inflected) with a dative dependent on the main

verb or verbal phrase. Concerning this idiom in West-Saxon and in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 124-125, 214, and 245-247.

II. INFLECTED

Of the inflected Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject, in the subjective use, I have found but two examples, one phrase being the subject of a passive verb:—

bia(n) (wosa), *be,* plus **rehtlic,** *proper* (1): *L.* (1): I. 7.20: onsione heofnes *cunnande rehtlice were* tid *to oncnauanne* eawunga & æc geðiodsumnise to ðæm fionde on woeg foresægeð = faciem caeli *probantes debere* tempus *intellegere* manifestum atque consentiendum aduersario in uia pronuntiat.

gedæfniga, *be fitting* (1): *L.* (1): 21.9: *gedæfned is* ærist *ðas to wosanne = oportet* primum *haec fieri.*

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Here the inflection of the Predicative Infinitive is clearly due to the influence of the dative-governing adjective (*rehtlic*) and verb (*gedæfniga*).

B. The Passive Infinitive

Of the strictly passive infinitive (that is, of the infinitive made up of *bia(n)* (*wosa*) plus the perfect participle), as the Predicate of an Accusative Subject, in subjective clauses, I have found no clear example. But, as shown in my running comments on the active infinitive in section A above, pp. 127 ff., several of the uninflected infinitives that are active in form translate Latin passive infinitives, and appear themselves to be passive in sense.

NOTES

1. *The Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction.* In sentences like the following we have what for lack of a better name I have denominated "the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction," in which the infinitive is to be

supplied both in the gloss and in the Latin original:—*Mat.* I. 20.4: *geðrouende hine foresægde* = *Passurum se prænuntians; Mk.* I. 4.14ª: ec *forecueð hine slaende* = Item *praedicens* se *occidendum.* But this idiom, of which several varieties occur, belongs rather in the section (xv) entitled "Some Substitutes for the Infinitive," where it is treated at length.

2. *An Inflected Predicative Infinitive without "To"* occurs in *Mat.* I. 20.11, in *L.* I. 10.15, and in *J.* I. 8.2 (quoted on pp. 135 and 136).

APPENDIX VI

THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH ACCUSATIVE SUBJECT IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Since the publication of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* in 1913, there have come to my attention several articles that deal with the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject in some one of the Germanic languages, and that call for brief notice here.

In the first number of Vol. xxxix of Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur,* pp. 201-209, issued in September, 1913, about two months after the publication of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* Dr. M. J. van der Meer published an instructive study of "Der Gotische Acc. c. Inf. in Subjectsätzen und nach *Swaei* und *Swe.*" In this article Dr. van der Meer gives detailed consideration to each instance of the accusative-with-infinitive construction in subjective clauses, in the Greek original (about 15 examples) and in the Gothic translation (about two examples), and re-affirms the view, earlier expressed by himself, by Professor Streitberg, and by a number of the elder Gothic scholars,[22] that the construction in Gothic is due to the influence of the Greek original. I was glad to find this fresh and independent confirmation of the view expressed in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (which latter had appeared too recently to be seen by Dr. van der Meer), that, not only in Gothic, but in the Germanic languages as a whole, the

[21] These are mentioned in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 245.

accusative-with-infinitive construction is a borrowed idiom in subjective clauses. Dr. van der Meer was in error, however, in declaring, as he did in the opening sentence of his article, that this construction is not found in any of the older Germanic languages except Gothic: "Weil diese constructionen in den anderen altgermanischen sprachen nicht vorkommen, bis jetzt wenigstens noch nicht nachgewiesen sind," etc. At least one example occurs in Tatian (187.9: *gilimphit mih gangan* = *oportet me ambulare*), according to Dr. A. Denecke, in his *Der Gebrauch des Infinitivs bei den Althochdeutschen Uebersetzern des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts,* a Leipzig dissertation of 1880. And about fourteen examples occur in West-Saxon. In both languages the construction is directly due to the influence of the Latin original: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 124-125, 214, 245-246.

Of the accusative-with-infinitive construction in Dutch, I gave no account in my section on this idiom in the Germanic languages in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 241-248. But I wish now to call attention to the treatment of this subject by Dr. W. L. van Helten, in his "Over den Afhankelijken Infinitief zonder *Te,*" in the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde,* x, 1891, pp. 237-240; and by Dr. F. A. Stoett, in his *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst: Syntaxis,* edition of 1889, p. 34. Dr. Stoett declares that this construction in Dutch is due to Latin influences: "In 't mnl. vindt men na sommige werkwoorden meermalen eene constructie met den accusativus cum infinitivo, hoogst waarschijnlijk als eene navolging uit het Latijn. Die werkwoorden zijn *sien, mercken, vernemen, vinden, weten, horen, voelen, laten, seggen, doen, heeten.*"

IX. THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH DATIVE SUBJECT

Several scholars of great distinction, as Jacob Grimm and Professor Wilhelm Streitberg, hold that, in the Gothic *Mark* 2.23 (*jah warþ þairhgaggan imma þairh atisk* = καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν . . . διὰ τῶν σπορίμων), we have a Predicative Infinitive with a Dative Subject substantially identical

with the well-known predicative infinitive with an accusative subject, as illustrated in the Greek original of the passage just quoted. In *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 127-131, 214, 248-252, I have tried to give reasons for the belief there stated that in this and similar Gothic passages we have not a predicative, but a subjective, infinitive, and that the dative, instead of being the subject of the infinitive, is dependent upon the chief verb; in a word, that there is no real, but only an apparent, predicative infinitive with a dative subject in Gothic. I added, however, that if, in the Gothic passages in question, the infinitive is to be considered predicative and to have a dative subject, I thought that we should consider that we have a dative-with-infinitive construction in such West-Saxon passages as the following:—*Mark* 9.47: *betere ðe* is mid anum eagan *gan* on Godes rice = 9.46: *bonum est tibi luscum* introire in regnum Dei; *Luke* 24.26[a,b]: Hu ne *gebyrede Criste ðas ðing ðoligean,* and swa on his wuldor *gan?* = Nonne haec *oportuit pati* Christum, et ita *intrare* in gloriam suam? I further added that, although the phrase, "the dative with infinitive," in the sense assigned to it by Grimm, is usually restricted to the dative with infinitive after impersonal verbs, I could not see why, if the phrase is to be used at all, it should not be used with reference, also, to the dative with infinitive after certain personal verbs, as in the West-Saxon *Luke* 9.59: *alyf me*[22] æryst *bebyrigean* minne fæder = *permitte mihi* primum *ire,* et *sepelire* patrem meum. I am still of the opinion that we do not have a true predicative infinitive in such locutions, Gothic or Anglo-Saxon. It may be well, however, to see how the *Lindisfarne Gospels* renders the Latin original (a predicative infinitive with an accusative subject) in these passages. In the 15 examples of an infinitive and a dative cited by me from the *West-Saxon Gospels* on pages 127-129 of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* all but three have a predicative infinitive with an accusative subject in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* In these three we have in all probability,

[22] *Me,* of course, may here be an accusative, but, in the monograph referred to, I have given reasons for considering it a dative.

as in West-Saxon, a subjective or objective infinitive with a dative dependent on the main verb:—*Mark* 9.47: god *is ðe* anege *ingeonga* in ric godes = bonum *est tibi* luscum *introire* in regnum dei; *Matthew* 17.4ª: god *is us* her *to wossanne* [23] = bonum *est nos* hic *esse* (West-Saxon with inflected [23] infinitive also: god *ys* us her *to beonne*); *Luke* 9.59: *forgef uel gelef me* aerist *geonga* & (*sic*) ðæt ic byrġa faeder min = *permitte mihi* primum *ire* et *sepelire* patrem meum. The Latin influence, therefore, is stronger in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in the *West-Saxon Gospels:* in the former the Latin accusative-with-infinitive construction is usually kept; in the latter it is usually rendered by a subjective or objective infinitive and a dative dependent on the finite verb,—the latter a native Germanic idiom.

APPENDIX VII

THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH DATIVE SUBJECT IN THE OTHER GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Since the publication of my chapter on the so-called "Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject" in 1913, two noteworthy articles on the dative-with-infinitive construction have been published: the late Dr. Erwin Stimming's *Der Accusativus cum Infinitivo im Französischen* (= *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie,* Heft LIX), Halle a. S., 1915, which has, besides numerous scattered passages, a whole chapter devoted to the dative with an infinitive in French, and Professor A. M. Sturtevant's "Zum Gotischen Dativ nach *Wairþan* mit Infinitiv," in *Modern Language Notes,* XXXII, 1917, pp. 141-151. Besides these two studies, there is a third that deserves consideration here, namely, a note on the dative-with-infinitive construction by Dr. Wilhelm Havers, in his *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen* (= *Untersuchungen zur Indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft,* Heft III), Strassburg, 1911, pp. 263-264, which work, though it appeared

[23] Concerning the occasional inflection of the infinitive in this construction, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 129.

before the publication of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* in 1913, had escaped my notice. It will be convenient to take up the note by Dr. Havers first and the chapter by Dr. Stimming last.

After explaining that, in the Gothic *Mark* 4.25 (*jah saei ni habaiþ jah þatei habaiþ afnimada imma* = ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ), " hier hat Wulfila gleichsam ein Kompromiss geschaffen zwischen seiner Muttersprache und dem griech. Text; ein Zugeständnis an erstere ist der Dativ *imma* ohne Präposition *af,* ein Zugeständnis an die Vorlage die Wahl des komponierten *afnimada* statt des einfachen *nimada,*" Dr. Havers gives this footnote concerning the alleged instances of the Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject in Gothic, *l. c.,* p. 263: " So erklären sich auch die Fälle, wo dem griech. Akk. c. Inf. im Gotischen scheinbar ein Dativus c. Inf. gegenübersteht, z. B. Mc. 2.23 *jah warþ þairhgaggan imma . . . þairh atisk* = καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν . . . διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, ähnlich L. 6, 1. Ein Zugeständnis an den griech. Text ist hier die Stellung des *imma* hinter dem Infinitiv entsprechend dem hinter den griech. Inf. gestellten αὐτόν; ein Zugeständis dagegen an das germanische Sprachempfinden ist die Verbindung des *warþ* mit dem Dat. *imma,* vgl. *L.* 20, 14 *ei uns wairþai þata arbi* = ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία. Vgl. über diesen scheinbaren got. Dat. c. Inf. ausser Streitberg, Got. Elementarb. § 318, J. Grimm, Dtsch. Gram. 4, 131 Anm., der hier wegen der eigentümlichen Stellung des Dativs einen wirklichen Dativus c. Inf. annimmt, Winkler, Germ. Kasussynt. S. 17, Köhler S. 289 f., van der Meer § 57, Stolzenburg Z. f. Dtsch. Ph. 37 (1905) S. 174. Eine Kompromisskonstruktion zeigt auch L. 2.6 *usfullnodedun dagos du bairan izai* = ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν." As Dr. Havers twice uses the word *scheinbar* (once in contrast to Grimm's *wirklich*) in describing these alleged examples of this idiom, I take it that, as I do, he considers that we have only an apparent, not a real, Predicative Infinitive with Dative Subject; indeed, he expressly declares that, in *Mark* 2.23, *imma* depends upon *warþ.* And, again as I did in 1913, he attributes the post-

position of the dative, of which fact Grimm and Professor Streitberg seek to make so much, solely to the influence of the Greek.

Professor Sturtevant, *l. c.*, p. 141, declares his belief that the Gothic Dative with an Infinitive after *warþ* (as in *Mark* 2.23, already quoted by me) is a genuine Germanic idiom. And he holds that, in this construction, the dative is more closely related to the infinitive (presumably, therefore, as subject, as held by Grimm and by Professors Streitberg and Winkler) than to the finite verb, *warþ*, for he explicitly rejects the explanation of the dative offered by A. Köhler,[24] that the dative is the indirect object of *warþ*, and that the infinitive is the subject of *warþ*, which explanation by Köhler, as I stated in 1913, seems to me the correct one. To the Köhler explanation, however, Professor Sturtevant objects that it would preclude our considering *warþ* as an impersonal verb (p. 142): "Das wäre nun an sich ganz einleuchtend, wenn Köhler nicht durch diese Auffassung gezwungen wäre, den Infinitiv nach *wairþan* als substantivisch aufzufassen, wobei das Verbum *wairþan* dann nicht unpersönlich, sondern als Prädikat für das infinitivische Subjekt stehen soll; vgl. z. B. Mc. 2.23 *warþ þairhgaggan imma*, wo nach Köhler *þairhgaggan* für ein nicht existierendes Substantiv für *Durchgang* steht, 'das etwa **þairhgaggs* heissen müsste,' ebenso **gaggs* für *gaggan* (*L.* 6.1), **swults* für *gaswiltan* (*L.* 16.22) usw." This objection seems to me untenable, for I cannot see that to make the infinitive the subject of the verb robs the finite verb of its impersonality any more than to make the infinitive phrase the subject of the finite verb (in Greek the accusative with its infinitive, in Gothic the dative with its infinitive, with the modifiers of the infinitive in each instance) would rob the finite verb of its impersonality. With the exception of a few verbs like *rain, snow*, etc., most impersonal verbs do have an expressed subject, usually a phrase or a clause, though often a single word,

[24] This explanation was earlier offered by Gabelentz and Loebe, and was later advocated by Bernhardt, but these scholars are not mentioned by Professor Sturtevant: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 249.

an infinitive. The position just stated seems substantially identical with that of the late Professor Wilmanns. In his *Deutsche Grammatik,* III, 1 (1906), § 64, after explicitly declaring of the dative in the dative-with-infinitive construction that " Der Dativ lässt sich überall als abhängig von dem regierenden Prädikat auffassen," Professor Wilmanns cites examples of this construction after impersonal verbs (*galeikan, wairþan*), and expressly declares that, in these examples, the infinitive is the subject of the finite verb.

If I understand him correctly, Professor Sturtevant then offers a second objection to the Köhler theory, namely, that the relationship of the infinitive to the finite verb must be the same in the Gothic translation as in the Greek original (p. 142): " Zwischen dem Dativ des entfernteren Objekts und dem Dativ in engerer Beziehung zum Infinitiv—d. h. dem Dativ der Beteiligung—ist manchmal keine scharfe Grenzlinie zu ziehen; sie lassen sich sogar manchmal nicht unterscheiden, und gegen Köhler's Erklärung des Dativs mit Infinitiv nach *wairþan* wäre nichts einzuwenden, wenn es schon festgestellt wäre, dass im Gotischen der Infinitiv *nicht vom Verbum finitum abhängig ist,*[25] gerade wie im Griechischen. *Es liegt aber kein zwingender Grund vor, dem gotischen Infinitiv ein anderes syntaktisches Verhältnis zum Verbum finitum* (*warþ*) *als dem griechischen Infinitiv zum Verbum finitum* (ἐγένετο) *zuzuschreiben.*" [26] There are several strong, if not compelling, reasons, I reply, for considering the relationship of the infinitive to the finite verb different in the specified Gothic examples from that of the infinitive to the finite verb in the Greek originals. (1) As the Gothic uses the accusative with an infinitive after *wairþan* as well as a dative with an infinitive after that verb, it is highly probable that the infinitive in the two idioms is to be construed differently, as suggested by Köhler. (2) In somewhat similar impersonal locutions, made up of an adjective plus the verb *to be,* as in *Luke* 18.25 (*raþizo allis ist ulbandau . . . þairhleiþan* =

[25] The italics here are Professor Sturtevant's.
[26] The italics here are mine.—M. C., Jr.

εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστι κάμηλον . . . εἰσελθεῖν), cited by Professor Sturtevant himself (p. 142), most, if not all, Gothic scholars consider that the infinitive in the Gothic is the subject of *ist,* though they consider that, in a passage like *Luke* 16.17 (*iþ azetizo ist himin jah airþa hindarleiþan þau witodis ainana writ gadriusan* = εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστιν τὸν οὐρανὸν και τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν), in which we have in Gothic as in Greek an accusative with an infinitive, the infinitive is the predicate of the accusative subject in Gothic as in Greek. How Professor Sturtevant would construe the infinitive in the former example is not clear to me from his footnote on p. 142, where he speaks of these two constructions; but, from footnote 7 on p. 143, I presume that he considers the dative-with-infinitive construction after an adjectival predicate to be on the same footing as after *warþ.* In *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 127-128, I called attention to this double construction of the infinitive with an adjective plus *is* or *was* in West-Saxon, and stated that, when accompanied by a dative, the infinitive is the subject of the impersonal verb (*is* or *was*). In the Gothic *Luke* 18.25, quoted above, Professor Wilmanns, *l. c.,* § 64, considers the infinitive the subject of *ist.* (3) We have a similar interchange of predicative infinitive and of substantival infinitive after certain transitive verbs in Latin, in Gothic, in Old High German, and in Anglo-Saxon. For the Latin, take the Vulgate *Matthew* 8.21 (*permitte me* primum *ire,* et *sepelire* patrem meum), with its predicative infinitive, over against *Luke* 9.59 (*permitte mihi* primum *ire,* et *sepelire* patrem meum), with its objective infinitive. For the Gothic, contrast *Luke* 8.29 (unte *anabaud ahmin* þamma unhrainjin *usgaggan* af þamma mann = παρήγγελλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτω ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) with 1 *Timothy* 6.13 (*anabiuda . . . fastan þuk þo anabusn* = παραγγέλλω . . . τηρῆσαί σε τὴν ἐντολήν). According to Professor Wilmanns, *l. c.,* § 65, 3, only once is *anabiudan* found with an infinitive and an accusative, the usual construction being with an infinitive and a dative. Similarly Dr. Denecke, in his *Der Gebrauch des Infinitivs bei*

den Althochdeutschen Uebersetzern des 8. und 9. Jahrhunderts, a Leipzig dissertation of 1880, p. 41, states that, in Tatian, *gabiotan* is usually followed by a dative with an infinitive, as in 120.3 (*gibot uns* Moyses in thesa uuisun *zi steinonne*[27] = Moyses *mandavit nobis* huiusmodi *lapidare*), but is once followed by an accusative and an infinitive, as in 80.7 (Inti sar *gibot* her thie *iungiron stigan* in skef = Et statim *iussit discipulos ascendere* in navicula). In Anglo-Saxon, likewise, this interchange of dative and of accusative is found after *bebeodan,* 'command':— *Wærferð* 9.31 gives us the dative: hu he *bebead* ðære *nædran* ða wyrta to *healdenne* (with no corresponding Latin); while *Exodus* 217ª gives us the accusative: oð Moyses *bebead eorlas* . . . folc *somnigean.* In all these Germanic examples in (3), when the dative is used with the infinitive, the infinitive is the object of the finite verb; but, when the accusative is used with the infinitive, the infinitive is the predicate of the accusative noun or pronoun,—a distinction again made by Professor Wilmanns (*l. c.,* § 65, 1-3). Similarly to differentiate the infinitive with the accusative after *warþ* from the infinitive with the dative after *warþ* seems to me equally reasonable, if not necessary.

Professor Sturtevant proceeds to give the positive grounds for his belief that the dative with an infinitive is a genuine Germanic construction. First, because in only one instance (*Luke* 4.36) is the Greek accusative with infinitive, when rendered by an infinitive construction, turned otherwise than by an infinitive with a dative, of which latter construction five examples occur in the Gothic. Second, kindred, if not identical, constructions are found in the North Germanic and in the West Germanic languages. Here Dr. Sturtevant cites, among other examples, the two following (p. 145): (1) "Vgl. anord. *þat verðr mörgum manni at um myrkvan staf villisk* (*Egliss.* Vers), 'es geschieht manchem Manne, dass'—, 'er kommt in den Fall, wird genötigt—' usw. mit got. *warþ þairhgaggan*

[27] Concerning the inflection of the infinitive here and in the Anglo-Saxon example below, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 129 and 250-251.

imma, 'es geschah ihm, dass'—'es begab sich, dass er hindurchging.' Im Anord. steht (gerade wie im Gotischen) die Person, die an der Verbalhandlung beteiligt ist, im Dativ;" and (2) he compares the old High German "*iz uuirdit ethesuuane iu zi wizanne* (Otfrid IV. 11, 28) mit anord. *þat varð mörgum* manni—*at villisk* und mit got. *warþ þairhgaggan imma.*" These two examples seem to me the most pertinent for his purpose of all cited by Dr. Sturtevant, and yet by no means to prove the existence of a predicative infinitive with dative subject in Old Norse, in Old High German, or in Gothic. In each of the two examples, it seems to me, the infinitive is substantival, not predicative, and is in apposition to the introductory pronoun (*þat, iz*). In other words, the examples seem to me to favor the Köhler explanation of the dative with infinitive rather than the Grimm-Streitberg-Sturtevant explanation. Let me add that in 1913, as I now do, I not only admitted that an infinitive with a dative was found in the Germanic languages, but I cited not a few examples thereof from several of the Germanic languages, including Old Norse and Old High German. What I denied was, and is, that the infinitive here is a predicative infinitive having a dative subject. To me, the infinitive seemed, as claimed by Köhler and Havers, substantival; and the dative seemed, not the subject of the infinitive, but a complement of the finite verb. And, despite Dr. Sturtevant's interesting article, this view of 1913 is all the stronger to-day.

The most important factor in the origin of the dative with an infinitiv is not mentioned by Professor Sturtevant. The true explanation, as I believe, not only for the Slavic languages, but also for the Germanic languages as a whole, was long ago given by Miklosich, who tells us that, in the Slavic languages, where the construction is most frequent, the dative with infinitive (after impersonal verbs) arose because of the very large number of dative-governing verbal nouns therein: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 128, and the references there given. Similarly, as I have tried to show in the monograph just re-

ferred to, the dative with infinitive occurs most commonly, in the Germanic languages, after dative-governing verbs or verbal phrases, though, naturally enough, at times, by analogy, the idiom occurs also after impersonal verbs and verbal phrases that do not govern a dative object. As for the transitive verbs that are at times followed by a dative with infinitive along with the accusative with infinitive in the Germanic languages, as certain verbs of Commanding, illustrated on p. 150 above, the two-fold construction rests partly on the double regimen of the personal verbs in question, which govern noun objects in both the dative and the accusative, and partly on the influence of the Greek and Latin originals.

In his opening paragraph Professor Sturtevant declares that no thorough comparison of the Gothic Dative-with-Infinitive Construction with the similar construction in the other Germanic languages has been made: "Diese dem Gotischen scheinbar eigentümliche Konstruktion, die zur Übersetzung des griechischen ἐγένετο mit Infinitiv und Akkusativ der Person dient, ist schon von Köhler, Winkler und anderen [28] behandelt worden. Jedoch fehlt es meines Wissens noch immer an einer einigermassen gründlichen Vergleichung der betreffenden Konstruktion im Gotischen mit den syntaktischen Verhältnissen der übrigen germanischen Sprachen,[29] besonders mit denen des Nordgermanischen, das im allgemeinen dem Gotischen syntaktisch näher verwandt ist als das Westgermanische." And, in his concluding paragraph, he again laments the lack of such comparative studies of Gothic syntactical problems: "Das Studium der gotischen Syntax leidet immer noch daran, dass man geneigt ist, sich ausschliesslich auf das Gotische zu beschränken, statt auf die Syntax der übrigen germanischen Sprachen gebührende Rücksicht zu nehmen. Dieses Verfahren wäre in

[28] In a footnote Professor Sturtevant gives specific references for the discussion of this idiom in Gothic by A. Köhler, by H. Winkler, and by J. Grimm, which, however, need not be given here.

[29] He here quotes, in a footnote, a sentence from Professor Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, § 234, 2, on the value of such a comparative study of Gothic constructions.

der Formenlehre doch unerhört." Dr. Sturtevant's citations from Old Norse have done something towards filling up the gap complained of. It is unfortunate, however, that, in his own article, he takes no account of the previous comparative studies of the dative-with-infinitive construction given in my own *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* Professor W. Wilmanns's *Deutsche Grammatik,* III, 1, Strassburg, 1906, and the classical works by F. Miklosich, "Ueber den Accusativus cum Infinitivo," Wien, 1869, and by Professor J. Jolly, *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen,* München, 1873.

Dr. Stimming makes several very interesting statements concerning the dative-with-infinitive construction in French which at the same time have a bearing (not stated by him) on this construction in the Germanic languages. On pp. 101-103, for example, he tells us that certain verbs of Commanding (*commander, rover,* etc.), though originally followed by an accusative with infinitive, came to be followed, also, by a dative with infinitive; and that the double construction with the infinitive is probably due to the double regimen of the finite verbs in question, which governed a noun object in the accusative and the dative,—the very explanation that had been offered by me for the double construction of the infinitive with verbs of Commanding and of Allowing in Anglo-Saxon: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 129-130. Again, on pp. 111-113, we learn that certain Impersonal verbs (*convient, estuet,* etc.), though originally followed by an accusative with infinitive, likewise came to be followed by the dative with infinitive, probably, Dr. Stimming thinks, because of the dativel sense in these verbs,—a close parallel to the explanation offered by me for the double construction of the infinitive after *god is, gebyrede,* and other impersonal verbs and verbal phrases: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 127-129. Finally, he gives a whole chapter to "Die Dativkonstruktion bei *Faire, Laisser* und den Verben der Sinnlichen Wahrnehmung," pp. 69-91, as in the Modern French *Je les lui fais* (*laisse, vois*) *examiner,* 'I make (let,

see) him examine them.'[30] In this third group of verbs as in the two preceding groups, Dr. Stimming speaks of the dative as the subject of the infinitive; but he is probably using the term *subject* in the loose sense of logical subject, since he is careful to state, p. 188, that "Bei *faire, laisser, voir, ouir, entendre* und mittelfranzösisch *souffrir* = *laisser* hat man in ihm [the Dative] wahrscheinlich mit H. F. Muller den 'datif de l'agent du passif,' nach Tobler einen Kasus der Beteiligung zu sehen." Professor Armstrong, let me add, in the examples above given, speaks of *lui* as the object of the finite verb, not the subject of the infinitive. But, whether Dr. Stimming considers the dative after these several groups of verbs as the grammatical subject and the infinitive as the grammatical predicate, he is quite right, I think, in extending the use of the phrase, "the dative with infinitive," to the dative and infinitive after personal verbs as well as after impersonal verbs and in not restricting the latter class to a single verb like *warþ* of the Gothic. Moreover, as already implied, Dr. Stimming has unwittingly furnished several happy French parallels to the dative-with-infinitive construction in Anglo-Saxon.

Finally, let me add that, in his recent *Kurze Historische Syntax der Deutschen Sprache* (1915), p. 92, Professor Hans Naumann holds that the dative, in the dative-with-infinitive construction, depends upon the finite verb except in the Gothic: "Es wird auch Niemand daran zweifeln, dass, wenn das 'Subjekt' des Infinitivs im Dativ steht, dieser nicht vom Infinitiv, sondern vom Hauptverb abhängt, vgl. got. *gebun imma drigkan*[31] *wein, galeikada jah mis meljan;* ahd. *guot ist uns hir zi wesanne; ich erlaube ihm zu gehen.* Hierher auch mit Verschiebung des Abhängigkeitsverhältnisses der gotische 'Dativus cum Infinitivo,' vgl. *warþ gaswiltan þamma unledin.*" As al-

[30] This example is taken from Professor E. C. Armstrong's *Syntax of the French Verb*, second edition, New York, 1915, p. 9.

[31] This seems to me an infelicitous example, as I consider *drigkan* to denote purpose here: see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 148, Note 6.

ready intimated in preceding paragraphs, I hold that no convincing proof has ever been offered that a shifting of dependence from the finite verb to the infinitive took place in Gothic; to me the last Gothic example of the dative-with-infinitive construction given by Professor Naumann stands on substantially the same footing as the second Gothic example and the Old High German example thereof given by him, in each of which latter he admits the dependence of the dative upon the finite verb. Again I am pleased to see the phrase, "the Dative with Infinitive," extended to personal as well as to impersonal verbs.

So far as I can see, therefore, the studies that have appeared of the dative-with-infinitive construction since the publication of *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* in 1913, tend to confirm the position then taken, and now reaffirmed with reference to the Northumbrian as represented in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* that, in the dative-with-infinitive construction, whether after impersonal or personal verbs, the infinitive is substantival, not predicative, in function, and that the dative is more intimately connected with the finite verb of its clause than with the infinitive.

X. THE FINAL INFINITIVE

A. The Active Infinitive

1. *With Active Finite Verb*

The active infinitive denoting Purpose, with active verbs, occurs about 124 times (136 including the "Introductions") in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Of these infinitives, 54 are uninflected, and 82 are inflected. In the *West-Saxon Gospels,* there are 79 final infinitives, of which 42 are uninflected, and 37 are inflected.

The final infinitive seems to me dominantly, if not exclusively, active in sense as well as in form. Possibly the inflected infinitive in *Mat.* 20.28[a], which translates a Latin passive infinitive, is passive in sense, though active in form: sua sunu monnes ne cuom him *to heranne* ah he to embehtane oðrum &

sella sawel his eftlesing *uel* alesenis fore monigum = Sicut filius hominis non *uenit ministrari* sed ministrare et dare animam suam redemtionem pro multis (Rushw.: ne cwom ðæt him *wære ðægnad* ah he ðægnade; W. S.: ne com ðæt him *man ðenode* ac ðæt he ðenode). Some would hold that the inflected infinitives in *Mat.* 20.19[a,b,c], which translate a Latin *ad* plus a gerund, are passive in sense: *sellas* hine hæðnum *to telenne uel to besuicanne & to suinganne & to hoanne* = tradent eum gentibus *ad deludendum* et *flagellandum* et *crucifigendum*. But to me the infinitive in such cases seems active in sense as in form, for reasons that are stated in detail in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 132, and that need not be repeated here.

I. Only the uninflected Final Infinitive is found with these verbs:— [32]

bringa (1), *bring* (W. S.: I. (6) only).
foregeonga (1), *precede* (W. S.: lacking).
gecuma (2), *come* (W. S.: I. (1) only).
giwiga (1), *request* (W. S.: lacking).
iorna (1), *run* (W. S.: I. (1) only).
ofstiga (1), *descend* (W. S.: lacking).
winna (1), *labor, strive* (W. S.: I. (2) only).

Typical examples are:—

Mat. 28.8[b]: *iornende beada uel sægca* ðegnum his = *currentes nuntiare* discipulis eius.

J. 4.33: ænigmon *brohte* him *eatta?* = aliquis *attulit* ei *manducare?*

J. 4.9: huu . . . *drinca* from mec *giues* ðu? = quomodo . . . *bibere* a me *poscis?*

J. I. 3.15[a,b]: ðætte ne *doema* ah *haele gecuome* midgeard & ðæt woere aedeauad cuæð uoerc = quod non *iudicare* sed *saluare uenerit* mundum et manifestari dicit opera.

[32] The figure in parenthesis in these lists indicates the number of occurrences of each verb in this construction. For the sake of comparison, I give also the construction of each verb in West-Saxon.

II. The Final Infinitive is found both uninflected and inflected with these verbs:— [33]

cuma (7 and 28), *come* (W. S.: 35 and 80).
fara (2 and 4), *go* (W. S.: 5 and 15).
foera (10 and 4), *go* (W. S.: 7 and 19).
gegeonga (1 and 1), *go* (W. S.: lacking).
geonga (2 and 7), *go* (W. S.: 40 and 20).
gesea (1 and 2), *see* (W. S.: lacking).
gesella (2 and 1), *give* (W. S.: 1 and 5).
sella (13 and 7), *give* (W. S.: 257 and 76).
senda (8 and 3), *send* (W. S.: 8 and 47).

The following examples are typical:—

Mat. 9.13: ne forðon *cuom* ic *geceige* soðfeaste ah synfullo = non enim *ueni uocare* iustos sed peccatores.—*Mat.* 2.2: we *cuomon to worðianne* hine = *uenimus adorare* eum.

L. 7.24[b]: forhuon *foerdon* gie on woestern *gesea?* = quid *existis* in desertum *uidere?*—*Mk.* 14.48: gie *foerdon* mið suordum & stengum *to gefoanne uel to læccanne* mec = *existis . . . comprehendere* me.

Mat. 27.48[b]: *salde* him *drinca* = *dabat* ei *bibere.*—*Mat.* 14.16[b]: *seallas* him *ge uel* iuh *eatta* = *date* illis uos *manducare.*—*Mat.* 20.19[a,b,c], with three inflected infinitives after *sella* translating Latin *ad* plus three gerundives in the accusative, is quoted on p. 156 above.

Mk. 3.14: ðætte *sende* hia *bodiga* godspell = ut *mitteret* eos *praedicare* euangelium.—*Mk.* I. 218: ðegnas *to bodanne* mið word mið gebrohtum mæhtum *sendeð* = discipulos *ad praedicandum* uerbo conlatis uirtutibus mittet.

III. The inflected Final Infinitive only is found with the following verbs:—

arisa (1), *arise* (W. S.: U., 2; I., 6).
astiga (1), *ascend* (W. S.: the same).
behalda (1), *behold* (W. S.: the same).

[33] In this list the first figure indicates the uninflected infinitive; the second, the inflected infinitive.

binda (1), *bind* (W. S.: the same).
doa (1), *do, make* (W. S.: the same).
eftgecerra (1), *return* (W. S.: lacking).
falla (1), *fall* (W. S.: lacking).
forecuma (1), *precede* (W. S.: lacking).
gearwiga (1), *prepare* (W. S.: the same).
gecerra (1), *return* (W. S.: U., 1; I., 1).
gemoeta (1), *find* (W. S.: lacking).
habba (2), *have* (W. S.: the same).
infoera (1), *enter* (W. S.: lacking).
læda (1), *lead* (W. S.: the same).
setta (1), *set* (W. S.: the same).
soeca (1), *seek* (W. S.: the same).
stiga (1), *ascend* (W. S.: lacking).
stonda (2), *stand* (W. S.: U., 1; I., 3).
tocuma (1), *come to* (W. S.: the same).
togeeca (2), *add* (W. S.: lacking).
ymbsceawiga (1). *look about* (W. S.: lacking).

A few examples will suffice:—

Mat. 14.23: *astag* in mor he ana *to biddanne* = *ascendit* in montem solus *orare.*

Mat. 13.30[b]: *bindas* ða bunda *uel* byrðeno *uel* sceafa *to bernenne* = *alligate* ea [in] fasciculas *ad comburendum.*

Mat. 4.9: gif ðu *fallas uel* slæhtes *to worðenne uel to worðianne* mec = si *cadens adoraueris* me.

Mat. 2.13 woen is . . . ðæt heroðes *soecas* ðone cnæht *to fordoanne uel to forlosanne* hine = futurum est enim ut herodes *quaerat puerum ad perdendum* eum.

L. 13.15: *lædes to wætranne* = *ducit ad aquare.*

The statistics of the Final active infinitive with active verbs in full are as follows[34] (U.: 54, of which 8 are in the "Introductions"; I.: 82, of which 5 are in the "Introductions"):—

arisa, *arise:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 4.16.

[34] In this section, besides the finite verb (the initial word) I give the infinitive when uninflected, but not when inflected.

astiga, *ascend:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 14.23.

behalda, *behold, look:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 1.26.

binda, *bind:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 13.30[b].

bringa, *bring:* **U.** (1):—**eatta**, *eat* (1): *J.* (1): 4.33.—**I.** (0).

cuma, *come:* **U.** (7):—**geceiga**, *call* (1): *Mat.* (1): 9.13. — — **gedoa**, *make* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.20.— — **gefriga (gefriega)**, *liberate* (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.49[b].— — **gehalgiga**, *save, sanctify* (1): *Mat.* (1): 18.11.— — **losiga**, *destroy* (1): *Mk.* (1): 1.24[b].— — **sella**, *give* (1): *Mat.* (1): 20.28[c].— — **senda**, *send* (1): *Mat.* (1): 10.34[c].—**I.** (28): *Mat.* (12): 2.2, 8; 5.16[a,b,c]; 8.29; 10.34[b], 35; 12.42; 20.28[a,b]; 28.1.—*Mk.* (3): 1.24[c]; 2.17; 15.36.—*L.* (8): 1.59; 4.34[b]; 5.32; 11.31; 12.49, 51; 19.10[a,b].—*J.* (5): 1.31[b]; I. 6.18, 19; 4.7[a], 15.

doa, *do, prepare:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.12.

eftgecerra, *return:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 24.18.

falla, *fall:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 4.9.

fara, *go:* **U.** (2):—**gearwiga**, *prepare* (1): *L.* (1): 1.76.— — **inlihta**, *illumine* (1): *L.* (1): 1.79[a].—**I.** (4): *Mk.* (1): 5.14.—*L.* (3): 1.77, 79[b]; 14.31.

foera, *go:* **U.** (9):—**efnegelæda**, *lead, conduct* (1): *Mat.* (1): 20.1.— — **gesea**, *see* (7): *Mat.* (3): 11.7[b], 8, 9.—*L.* (4): 7.24[b], 25[a], 26; 8.35[a].— — **gewæcca**, *awake, arouse* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 3.7[b].—**I.** (4): *Mk.* (1): 14.48.—*L.* (3): 6.12; 19.12[a,b].

forecuma, *come in advance:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 14.18.

foregeonga, *precede, go in advance:* **U.** (1):—**gegearwiga**, *prepare* (1): *L.* (1): 1.17.—**I.** (0).

gearwiga, *prepare:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 26.17[b].

gecerra, *return:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 13.16.

gecuma, *come:* **U.** (2):—**doema**, *judge* (1): *J.* (1): I. 3.15[a].— — **hæla**, *save* (1): *J.* (1): I. 3.15[b].—**I.** (0).

gegeonga, *go:* **U.** (1):—**gebidda**, *pray* (1): *Mk.* (1): 6.46. —**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 25.10.

gemoeta, *find, invent:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 6.7.

geonga, *go:* **U.** (3):—**fisciga**, *fish* (1): *J.* (1): 21.3.—

— **gegearwiga,** *prepare* (1): *J.* (1): 14.2.— — **sede,** *sow* (1): *Mat.* (1): 13.3[b].—**I.** (7): *Mat.* (3): 5.24; 18.12; 26.55. —*Mk.* (2): 3.21; 4.3.—*L.* (2): 8.5; 14.19.

gesea, *see:* **U.** (1):—**geworpa,** *pluck out* (1): *Mat.* (1): 7.5.—**I.** (2): *Mat.* (2): I. 1.7; 5.28.

gesella, *give:* **U.** (2):—**drinca (dringa),** *drink* (1): *Mat.* (1): 25.35[b].— — **eatta,** *eat* (1): *Mat.* (1): 25.35[a].—**I.** (1): *J.* (1): 6.52[b].

gesmiriga, *anoint:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 4.18[a].

giwiga, *request, demand:* **U.** (1):—**drinca,** *drink* (1): *J.* (1): 4.9.—**I.** (0).

habba, *have:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (2): *L.* (1): 14.28[c].—*J.* (1): 4.32.

innfoera, *enter:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 14.1.

iorna, *run:* **U.** (1):—**beada,** *announce* (1): *Mat.* (1): 28.8[b].—**I.** (0).

læda, *lead:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 13.15.

ofstiga, *descend:* **U.** (1):—**genioma,** *carry* (1): *Mat.* (1): 24.17.—**I.** (0).

sella, *give:* **U.** (13):—**drinca,** *drink* (5): *Mat.* (2): 25.42[b]; 27.48[b].—*Mk.* (1): 15.23.—*J.* (2): 4.7[b], 10.— — **eatta,** *eat* (7): *Mat.* (2): 14.16[b]; 25.42[a].—*Mk.* (2): 5.43[b]; 6.37[a].—*L.* (2): 8.55[b]; 9.13.—*J.* (1): 6.31.— — **geeatta,** *eat* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.1.—**I.** (7): *Mat.* (4): 20.19[a,b,c]; 27.34[a].— *Mk.* (3): 6.37[b]; 13.22; 15.15.

senda, *send:* **U.** (8):—**bodiga,** *preach* (3): *Mk.* (1): 3.14. —*L.* (2): 4.19[a]; 9.2[a].— — **forleta,** *forgive* (1): *L.* 4.18[c].— — **fulwiga (fulguia),** *baptize* (1): *J.* (1): 1.33[a].— — **gehrioppa,** *reap* (1): *J.* (1): 4.38.— — **hæla,** *heal* (1): *L.* (1): 9.2[b].— — **togeceiga,** *call* (1): *Mat.* (1): 22.3.—**I.** (3) *Mk.* (1): I. 2.18.—*L.* (2): 4.18[b]; 14.17.

setta, *set, instruct* (translating *instituens*): **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.13.

soeca, *seek:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mat.* (1): 2.13.

stiga, *go:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 17.31.

stonda, *stand:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (2): *Mat.* (1): 6.5[b].—*Mk.* (1): 11.25.

tocuma, *come to:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *L.* (1): 23.48(?).
togeeca, *add:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (2): *L.* (2): 20.11, 12.
winna, *strive:* **U.** (1):—**cweoða,** *say* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 1.11.—**I.** (0).
ymbsceawiga, *look about:* **U.** (0).—**I.** (1): *Mk.* (1): 5.32.

2. *With Passive Verbs*

Of the Final active infinitive modifying passive verbs, I have found only one example, in *Mk.* 7.4: oðero menigo sint ða ðe *gesald aron* ðæm *uel* him *to haldanne* = alia multa sunt quæ *tradita sunt* illis *seruare.*

DIFFERENTIATION OF THE TWO INFINITIVES

The Differentiation between the Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive, in the Final Use, in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* rests upon the same general principles as in West-Saxon. Only the uninflected infinitive is found after a few verbs (1) of motion and (2) of giving, listed above under I, which list differs somewhat, but not fundamentally, from that of West-Saxon. But the uninflected infinitive and the inflected infinitive are each found with a larger number of verbs (1) of motion and (2) of giving (occasionally, also, with *gesea,* 'see'), listed above under II, which list largely coincides with the corresponding list in West-Saxon. Finally, as in West-Saxon, a large number of verbs of varied signification is found with the inflected infinitive only. These verbs are given under III above. For the corresponding lists in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 133-145. When we consider the lateness of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and the fact that it is a gloss rather than a translation, the divergences from the West-Saxon appear negligible. The differentiation rests somewhat, also, on the Latin original, as is evident from what is said below.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

The evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as to the Origin of the Final Infinitive, as far as it goes, is confirmatory of the

conclusions reached as to the origin of the idiom in West-Saxon, namely: that the uninflected infinitive of purpose after verbs of motion was a native idiom in West-Saxon, the relative frequency of the idiom in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in the *West-Saxon Gospels,* being due in part to the frequency of the final infinitive in the Latin original; that the uninflected infinitive of purpose after verbs (1) of commanding and requesting and (2) of giving was probably due to Latin influence; and that the inflected infinitive of purpose, after verbs of whatever kind, was probably first suggested by the Latin (the constructions with gerund and gerundive, whether with or without the preposition *ad*). The Latin correspondents of the final infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* are as follows:—(1) for the uninflected infinitive: a final infinitive, 51; a final participle, 1; a noun (*potum*), 1;—for the inflected infinitive: *ad* plus a gerundive, 9; *ad* plus a gerund, 10; *ad* plus a noun, 1; a final infinitive, 56; *ad* plus an infinitive, 1; an appositive participle, past, 1; an objective infinitive, 1; a final participle, present, active, 1; a subjunctive, 1.

Concerning this construction in West-Saxon and in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 132-148, 215-217, and 252-256; also van Helten,[4] pp. 228-230.

B. The Passive Infinitive

No clear example has been found of the strictly passive infinitive used to denote purpose.

NOTES

1. *The Final Infinitive in a Series.*—In the following passages we have a series of two or more infinitives the first of which is inflected, but the succeeding is not: *Mat.* 20.28^{b,c}, quoted on p. 155 above; *L.* 4.18^{b,c}, 19^{a}: *sende* meh *to bodianne* ermingum *uel* gehæftendum forgefnise & blindum gesihðo, *forleta* ða gebroceno on forgefnise, *bodia* ger drihtnes ondfenge & dœge (*sic*) eftselenise = *misit* me *praedicare* captiuis remissionem et cæcis uisum, *dimittere* confractos in remissionem,

praedicare annum domini acceptum et diem retributionis.—On the other hand, as in the West-Saxon *Luke,* twice we have an uninflected infinitive succeeded by an inflected infinitive, owing no doubt to the influence of the Latin original, in which an infinitive is succeeded by *ad* plus a gerundive:—*L.* 1.76, 77, 79[a,b]: ðu before *færes* forðon fore onsione drihtnes *gearuiga* wegas his, *to selenne* wisdom . . . *inlihte* ðæm ða ðe in ðiostrum & in scua deaðes sittas *to rehtanne* foet usra = *praeibis* . . . *parare* uias . . . *ad dandam* scientiam . . . *inluminare* his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent *ad dirigendos* pedes nostros. For another, to me less probable, explanation of the alternation in the West-Saxon examples, offered by Professor Kenyon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 147. We have a series of two or more inflected infinitives in the following: *Mat.* 20.19[a,b,c], quoted on p. 156 above; *Mat.* 20.28[a,b], quoted on pp. 155-156 above (here the two inflected infinitives are followed by an uninflected infinitive); *L.* 19.10[a,b]: *cuom* forðon sunu monnes *to soecanne & to hælenne* = *Uenit* enim filius hominis *quaerere* et *saluare* quod perierat; *L.* 19.12[a,b]: *foerde* on lond unneh *uel* suiðe fearr *to onfoanne* him ric & eft he *to cerranne* = *abiit* in regionem longinquam *accipere* sibi regnum et *reuerti; J.* I. 6.18, 19: hine ne *to doemenne* ah *to haelanne* middangeard *gecuome* gecyðed bið = se non *ad iudicandum* sed *ad saluandum* mundum *uenisse* testatur.—It seems unnecessary to give here the series in which each infinitive is uninflected.

2. *An Alternation of the Two Infinitives* occurs with a single word in the following:—*Mat.* 10.34[c]: ne *cuom* ic frið *sende uel to sendenne* = non *ueni* pacem *mittere; Mk.* 1.24[b]: *cuome* ðu *losige uel to losane* usig? = *uenisti perdere* nos? *L.* 7.26: ah ymb huæd *foerdon* gie *gesea uel to sceawnne?* = sed quid *existis uidere?* L. 9.2[a]: *sende* hia *bodia uel to bodianne* ric godes = *misit* illos *praedicare* regnum dei.

3. *A Clause Alternates with an Infinitive* in *L.* 1.17, in conformity with the Latin original: he *foregæð* fore ðæm in gast & of *uel* mið mæht heliæs ðætte *gecerre* hearta. . . . In sunum

& ða ungeleaffulo to hogascipe soðfæstra *gegearuiga* drihtne folc wisfæst = ipse *praecedet* ante illum in spiritu et uirtute heliae ut *conuertat* corda patrum in filios et incredibiles ad prudentiam iustorum *parare* domino plebem perfectum.—An interchange of clause with infinitive for a single Latin word occurs in *Mat.* 12.42: forðon cuom from gemærum eorðo *ðæt hiu geherde uel to heranne* = quia *uenit* a finibus terrae *audire.*

4. *"Til" with a Final Infinitive* occurs in *Mat.* 26.17^{b}: huer wiltu ðæt we *gearuiga* ðe *til eottanne* eastro? = ubi uis *paremus* tibi *comedere* pascha?

5. *A Final Infinitive Alternates with a Present Participle* in *J.* 1.31^{b}: *cuom* ic in uætre *fulguande uel to fulguanne* = *ueni* ego in aqua *baptizans.*

6. *The Function of the Infinitive is not Clear* in the passage below, but *to sceawanne* probably denotes purpose:—*L.* 23.48: all ðæt here ðara ðaðe ædgeædre *tocuomon uel toweron to sceawanne* ðæt & gesegon ðaðe woeron aworden slægendo woeron hiora breosto eftcerrdon = omnis turba eorum qui simul aderant *ad spectaculum* istud et uidebant quæ fiebant percutientes pectora sua reuertebantur (Rushw.: al ðe here hiora ðaðe ætsceowunga togedre comun *to sceawunga* ðæt & gisegun etc., W. S.: eall wered ðe *æt ðisse wæfersynne* wæron & gesawon etc.). See Note 3 to Chapter II, p. 64.

7. *"The Split Infinitive."*—In his "Origin and Force of the Split Infinitive," *Modern Language Notes,* XXIX, 1914, pp. 41-45, Professor George O. Curme declares that the oldest examples of the Split Infinitive known to him are found in *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* (about 1320-1330 A. D.). Evidently he had not at that time seen my Note on this idiom in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon* (1913), p. 148 (at the end of the chapter on "The Final Infinitive"), in which I had cited an example of the split infinitive (with *for to*) from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* p. 256 of the Plummer edition, under the year 1127 of Manuscript E.

8. *A Final Infinitive without a Principal.*—In the following passages we have a final infinitive without a specific word (verb) for it to modify:—uninflected: *L.* 1.72[b];—inflected: *L.* 1.72[a]; 21.38. In the first two passages, the verb is implied in a noun, in Northumbrian and in Latin; in the third example, the Latin verb is not translated by the glossator.

9. *The Text is Probably Corrupt* in *Mark* I. 1.11: ne *wann* accennisse lichomæs ðon in ærrum awoendat were *cweoða* = non *laborauit* natiuitatem carnis quam in prioribus uicerat *dicere,* in which we have an uninflected infinitive of purpose (*cweoða*) modifying the finite verb (*wann*), corresponding respectively to the Latin *dicere* and *laborauit.* Although it occurs in several manuscripts, *uicerat* is probably a corruption for *uiderat,* which latter is the reading given in Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine,* p. 172. My friend and colleague, Professor Edwin W. Fay, head of our School of Latin, has kindly called my attention to Professor W. M. Lindsay's *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation,* p. 83, where we learn that, in Latin minuscule manuscripts, *cl* and *d* are often almost indistinguishable. The misreading of *uiderat* as *uicerat* probably accounts for the Northumbrian *awoendat were.* I cannot construe either *uicerat* or the other variant (*uincerat*) given for *uiderat* by Messrs. Wordsworth and White; and consequently the Northumbrian rendering of *uicerat,* namely, *awoendat were,* is unintelligible to me here.

XI. THE INFINITIVE WITH ADJECTIVES

A. The Active Infinitive

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the active infinitive that modifies an Adjective is inflected [35] 8 times, and is uninflected [35] 7 times. In West-Saxon, on the other hand, of 247 examples of the infinitive with adjectives, only 6 infinitives are uninflected; and in the *West-Saxon Gospels* all examples (4) are inflected.

[35] No examples occur in the "Introductions."

The infinitive, whether uninflected or inflected, is active in sense as in form.

I. THE INFINITIVE UNINFLECTED

The seven examples of the uninflected infinitive modifying an Adjective are as follows:—

gearo, *ready, prepared* (1):

L. 22.33: ðec mið *gearo* ic am in carcerne & æc in deaðe *geonga* = tecum *paratus* sum et in carcerem et in mortem *ire.*

gidyrstig, *audacious, daring* (1):

Mat. 22.46: ne ðe ðon *gidyrstig* wæs aenig . . . hine forðor *gefregna* = neque *ausus fuit* . . . eum amplius *interrogare* (or Consecutive?).

mæhtig, *mighty, powerful* (1):

Mk. 9.29: cuoeð to him ðis cynn on nænig *mæhtig ofgeonga* = dixit illis hoc genus in nullo *potens ire.*

min, *mine* (1):

Mat. 20.23^{b}: sitta uutedlice to suiðra minra & winstra ne is *min sella* = sedere autem ad dexteram meam et sinistram non est *meum dare.*

wyrða, *worthy* (3):

Mat. 3.11: his *uel* ðæs nam ic *wyrðe* gesceoe *beara* = cuius non sum *dignus* calciamenta *portare.*

Mk. 1.7^{c}: ðæs nam ic *wyrðe* forehlutende *undoa* ðuongas scoe his = cuius non sum *dignus* procumbens *soluere* corrigiam calciamentorum eius.

L. 21.36^{c}: ðætte gie se *wyrðo* to habbanne gefleanne ðas alle ða ðe tocymendo sint & *stonda* fora sune monnes = ut *digni* habeamini fugere ista omnia quae futura sunt et *stare* ante filium hominis.

II. THE INFINITIVE INFLECTED

The eight examples of the inflected infinitive modifying an Adjective I likewise give in full:—

eaðor, *easier* (1):

L. 10.12: ic cuoeðo iuh ðætte sodomon on dæge ðæm forge-

fenra *uel eaðor to forgeafanne* bið ðon ðær ceastra = dico uobis quia sodamis in die illa *remissius* erit quam illi ciuitati.

læt (hlæt), *slow* (1):

L. 24.25: la unwiso & *hlætto* ofer hearta *to gelefanne* in allum = o stulti et *tardi* corde *ad credendum.*

min, *mine* (1):

Mk. 10.40^{b}: sitta uutedlice to swiðra minra *uel* to winstra ne is *min to sellanne* = sedere autem . . . non est *meum dare.* [Cf. *Mat.* 20.23^{b}, above, where *min* is modified by an uninflected infinitive.]

nedðarf, *necessary* (1):

L. 23.17: *nedðarf* ðonne hæfeð *uel* hæfde *to forgeafanne* him . . . enne = *necesse* autem habebat *dimittere* eis . . . unum. [Or is *nedðarf* a noun here, as is claimed by Professor Cook, in his Glossary?]

scyldig, *guilty* (1):

Mat. 5.22: seðe uutedlice cueðas broðre his ðu unuis *uel* idle, *scyldig* bið *to boetanne* (*sic*) = qui autem dixerit fratri suo racha, *reus* erit *concilio.* [Rushworth: he bið *gemote scyldig;* W. S. he byð *geðeahte scyldig.*]

wyrðe, *worthy* (3):

L. 3.16: ðæs ne am ic *wyrðe to unbindanne* ðuongas sceoea his = cuius non sum *dignus soluere* corrigiam calciamentorum eius.

L. 21.36^{a,b}: quoted above, p. 166, under Uninflected. Notice there the erroneous translation of the Latin *habeamini* by *to habbanne.*

DIFFERENTIATION OF THE TWO INFINITIVES

As to the Differentiation of the Two Infinitives, the relatively large number of uninflected infinitives modifying an Adjective is somewhat surprising; for in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* alone more examples (7) are found than in the whole of West-Saxon literature (6). But the lack of inflection is due, I believe, partly to the remoteness of most of these infinitives from the adjective modified; partly to the frequency of the infinitive

instead of gerund or gerundive in the Latin original; and partly, in this as in other abnormal uses, to the idiosyncrasy of the glossator. As is implied in the preceding sentence, sometimes (as in *Mk.* 9.29 and *Mat.* 20.23[b]) the infinitive is not inflected although in juxtaposition with the adjective. The Latin correspondents are as follows:—for the uninflected infinitive: an adjective plus an infinitive, 6; an objective infinitive to *ausus fuit,* 1;—for the inflected infinitive: an adjective plus an infinitive, 4; an adjective with *ad* plus a gerund; 1; an adjective in the comparative degree, 1; an adjective plus a noun in the ablative, 1; and a subjunctive passive that is in proximity to an adjective and an infinitive, 1.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

As I have tried to show in the discussion of this construction in West-Saxon, the use of the Infinitive with Adjectives, whether uninflected or inflected, appears to be a native English idiom.

For the Infinitive with Adjectives in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 149-159, 217-218; and in the other Germanic languages, pp. 256-257.

B. The Passive Infinitive

I have found no example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* of the compound passive infinitive modifying an adjective. Only one example was found in all West-Saxon literature.

NOTES

1. *The Infinitive in a Series with Adjectives.*—In *L.* 21.36[a,b,c], quoted on p. 166 above, we have a series of three infinitives the first two of which are inflected, but the third is not.

2. *The Inflected Infinitive without "To"* occurs in *L.* 21.36[b], quoted on p. 166 above.

3. *An Inflected Infinitive Erroneously Translates a Latin Subjunctive Passive* that is in proximity to an adjective and an infinitive in *L.* 21.36[a], quoted on p. 166 above.

XII. OTHER ADVERBIAL USES OF THE INFINITIVE

Of Other Adverbial Uses of the infinitive than those already treated, namely, the infinitive of purpose and the infinitive of specification (with adjectives), but few examples occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.*

Possibly we have an Infinitive of Cause in *L.* 16.3: *to giornanne uel to færanne* on ælmessum ic *sceomigo* min = *mendicare erubesco* (Rushw.: lacking; W. S.: me *sceamað ðæt ic wædlige*).

Possibly, too, we have Infinitives of Result in the two following passages from *Luke*:—14.23: *gened to ingeonganne* ðætte sie gefylled hus min = *compelle intrare* ut impleatur domus mea (Rushw.: *gined* in *to ingeonganne;* W. S.: *nyd* hig ðæt hig *gan* in); 13.24[a]: *geðrincgas to ingeonganne* ðerh nearo gætt = *contendite intrare* per angustam portam (or Final?) (Rushw.: *geðringas to onginnane;* W. S.: *efstað* ðæt ge *gangen* ðurh ðæt nearwe get). Although I have put the infinitives in the following passages under the objective use with passive verbs (= the retained objective), it is possible that the infinitives are consecutive:—*Mat.* I. 7.3[a]: *were geneded* ðæt *awritta* = *cogeretur* ut *scriberet; Mat.* I. 6.19, 7.2: *geðreatad uel genedad is* . . . godcunde haelendes hero *uel* heista *awrita* & . . . *foreiorne uel* bicymo = *coactus est* . . . [de] diuinitate saluatoris altius *scribere* et . . . *prorumpere.*

Possibly, again, we have an infinitive denoting Means in *Mat.* I. 17.19: *cweð* . . . *to geafanne* mið efennisse getimbres hus ofer carr *uel* ofer sond = *dicit* . . . *adhibita comparatione* aedificantis domum super petram aut super herenam (*sic*).

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

The examples of the Causal, the Consecutive, and the Instrumental use of the infinitive are too few to determine the origin

of the idioms here. In all probability, however, for reasons stated in my discussion of these idioms in West-Saxon, the causal used is more largely due to Latin influence, but the consecutive use chiefly to native influence.

Of other adverbial uses than those specified, I have found no clear example in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. In all the examples given above, the infinitive is active in sense as in form.

For the situation in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 160-172, 218-220; and in the kindred Germanic languages, pp. 258-262.

APPENDIX VIII

THE CONSECUTIVE INFINITIVE IN GOTHIC

In Dr. M. J. van der Meer's article on "Der Gotische Acc. c. Inf. in Subjectsätzen und nach *Swaei* und *Swe,*" which appeared in the fall of 1913, and which was considered, in part, in Section VI, above, on "The Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject," he considers all the examples of the accusative-with-infinitive construction preceded by ὥστε in Greek (21 examples in all) and preceded by *swaei* and *swe* in Gothic (5 examples for the two particles), and reaffirms the opinion that had been generally held theretofore, that these five examples of the consecutive infinitive in the Gothic are due to the presence of this construction in the Greek original. Of the correctness of this view, there seems to me no question. But Dr. van der Meer's statement, in his opening sentence, already quoted by me on page 143 above, that this construction is not found in any of the older Germanic languages except Gothic, needs modification. A somewhat similar use of the infinitive (not of the infinitive with an accusative subject) to denote result is found in Old Norse after *saa* and in West-Saxon after *swa.* Concerning the history of opinion as to the latter idiom and as to the former one, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 162-168, 218-219, and 259-261.

XIII. THE INFINITIVE WITH NOUNS

A. The Active Infinitive

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* as in West-Saxon, when a Noun is modified by an infinitive, normally the infinitive is inflected. There are 17 [36] examples of the inflected infinitive to 7 examples of the uninflected in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* The proportion of inflected to uninflected infinitives in the *West-Saxon Gospels* is 26 to 1.

The infinitive that modifies a noun seems to me active in sense as in form.

I. THE INFINITIVE UNINFLECTED

Of the uninflected infinitive modifying a Noun, I give all the examples observed by me (7, of which one example occurs in the "Introductions"):—

mæht, *might, power* (6):

L. 5.24: *mæht* hafeð on eorðo *forgeafa* synna = *potestatem* habet in terra *dimittere* peccata.

L. 12.5: hæfeð *mæht gesenda uel* to gesendanne in tintergo = habet *potestatem mittere* in *gehennam.*

J. 1.12: gesalde ðæm *mæht* suno godes *wosa uel* ðæt hia uero = dedit illis *potestatem* filios dei *fieri.*

J. 5.27: *mæht* salde him & dom *gewyrce* = *potestatem* dedit ei et iudicium *facere.*

J. 19.10[a,d]: nastu ðætte *mæht* ic hafo *gehoa* ðe *uel* ðec to hoanne & *mæht* to forletanne ðec ðec (sic) *uel forleta* ðec? = nescis quia *potestatem* habeo *crucifigere* te et *potestatem demittere* te?

stefn, *voice* (1):

L. I. 3.16[a]: miððy acenned wæs iohannes mið *stefne gespreca* ðæm dumbe gesald wæs ðæm feder sona witgende = Nato iohanne *uox eloqui* muto redditur patri ilico prophetanti.

[36] Of these 17 inflected infinitives, 7 occur in the "Introductions"; with one exception all of the uninflected infinitives occur in the Gospels proper.

II. THE INFINITIVE INFLECTED

Of the inflected infinitive modifying a Noun, the examples in full are as follows (17, of which 7 are in the "Introductions"):—

becon, *sign* (1):

J. I. 3.13: huæt *becon* gesalde *to undoanne* tempul & ym ðrim dagum wæccennes clæn run *uel* godes degelnise setteð = quod *signum* daret *soluendi* templum et in triduo excitandi misterium ponit.

bisen, *example* (2):

Mat. (1): I. 20.19: *bisen* of ðæm wyrcendum in wingeard tid ungelic *uel* unefne efnegebrohtum *to brenganne* an & gelic cueð hea onfeingon mearde = *Parabolam* (*sic* for *parabola?*) de operariis in uinea tempore diuerso conductis *adhibita* unam paremque dicit eos accepisse mercedem.—*L.* (1): I. 8.5[a]: of gemnisse— —[= blanks] mið *bisseno* oxes *to wætranne* æfsægeð = de cura sabbati murmurantes *exemplo* bouis *adaquandi* refellit.

eare, *ear* (5):

Mat. (1): 13.9: seðe hæfes *earo to herranne* geherað = qui habet *aures audiendi* audiat.—*Mk.* (2): 4.9; 7.16.—*L.* (2): I. 8.15; 14.35.

(h)latto, *delay* (1):

L. (1): 12.45[a]: *hlatto* doað hlaford min *to cumanne* = *moram* facit dominus meus *uenire.*

huothwoegu, *something* (1):

L. (1): 7.40: ic hafo ðe *huothuoego to cuoeðanne* = habeo tibi *aliquid dicere.*

mæht, *might, power* (6):

Mat. (1): 9.6: hæfes *mæht* on eorðo forgefnisse *uel to forgefanne* synna = habet *potestatem* in terra *dimittendi* peccata.—*J.* (5): I. 6.5; 10.18[a,b]; 19.10[b,c] (quoted above under Uninflected, p. 171).

rod, *rood, cross* (1):

L. (1): 23.26[b]: geseton him ðæt *rod to bearanne* æfter ðone

hælend = imposuerunt illi *crucem portare* post iesum (or Final?). [The W. S. has: ða rode him onsetton *ðæt he hi bære* æfter ðam hælende.]

DIFFERENTIATION OF THE TWO INFINITIVES

As to the Differentiation of the Two Infinitives, when modifying a Noun, the lack of inflection seems to me due partly to the remoteness of the uninflected infinitive from the noun that it modifies, partly to the relatively large number of infinitives instead of gerunds or gerundives in the Latin original, and partly to the idiosyncrasy of the glossator. Sometimes, however, as in *L.* I. 3.16[a], the infinitive is not inflected although in juxtaposition with the noun that it modifies. How puzzled the glossator must have been at times is shown in *J.* 19.10[a,b,c,d] (quoted on p. 171 above): with the same word, *mæht,* the glossator in the first instance writes the uninflected infinitive and gives the inflected as the alternative rendering, but in the second instance reverses the order! Again, in *L.* 12.5, also quoted on p. 171 above, after *mæht* the glossator writes first the uninflected infinitive and, interchangeably, the inflected infinitive. That, as a rule, however, with nouns the infinitive was inflected in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as in West-Saxon, is evident from the fact, already incidentally stated, that the inflected form predominates over the uninflected in the proportion of 17 to 7.

The Latin correspondents to the infinitive with nouns is as follows:—for the uninflected infinitive: a noun with an infinitive, 7; for the inflected infinitive: a noun with a gerund in the genitive, 10; a noun with a gerundive in the genitive, 1; a noun with an infinitive, 5; an absolute participle phrase, 1.

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

The evidence of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as to the Origin of the Infinitive with Nouns in Anglo-Saxon seems to me in line with that derived from the West-Saxon. The idiom was native to West-Saxon, but the frequency of the construction therein

was in part due to the frequency of the constructions with gerund or gerundive in the Latin originals.

For this idiom in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 173-182, 220; and in the other Germanic languages, pp. 262-264.

B. The Passive Infinitive

No example has been found of the compound passive infinitive modifying a noun in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Nor was any example found in West-Saxon.

NOTES

1. *The Two Infinitives Alternate* in the following: *L.* 12.5 and *J.* 19.10[a,c], quoted on p. 171 above.

2. *An Uninflected Infinitive Alternates with a Clause* in *J.* 1.12, quoted on p. 171 above.

3. *The Inflected Infinitive Used as a Latin Gerundive.*—In *L.* I. 8.5[a], quoted on p. 172 above, the Lindisfarne inflected infinitive closely approximates a Latin gerundive. For this phenomenon in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 182.

4. *An Inflected Infinitive Interchanges with a Verbal Noun in "-Nes(s)"* that translates a Latin gerund in the genitive in the following: *J.* I. 3.13, *wæccennes,* quoted on p. 172 above; *J.* I. 6.5: *mæht* hæfde he cuæð *setnese* & eft *to onfoanne* sauel his = *Potestatem* habere se dicit *ponendi* ac *resumendi* animam suam. Cf. *J.* 10.18[a,b], in which we have two infinitives: *mæht* ic hafo *to settanne* hia . . . & *mæht* ic hafo æftersona *to onfoanne* hia = *potestatem* habeo *ponendi* eam et *potestatem* habeo iterum *sumendi* eam.—In the following an inflected infinitive alternates with a verbal noun in *-nes* that translates a Latin gerund in the genitive, for a single word: *Mat.* 9.6, *forgefnisse,* quoted on p. 172 above; *L.* 14.35: seðe hæfeð *earo to heranne uel hernises* gehereð = qui habet *aures audiendi* audiat. A noun in *-nes* translates a Latin gerund in the genitive in the following:—*Mk.* 4.23: gif hua hæfeð *earo hernisses* geherað = siquis habet *aures audiendi* audiat; *L.* 8.8[c]: seðe hæfeð *earo*

hernises geheraþ = qui habet *aures audiendi* audiat.—See Note 4 to Section II of the present chapter, p. 114, for an example of the verbal noun in *-ing* translating a Latin infinitive.

XIV. THE IMPERATIVE INFINITIVE

A use of the infinitive that is not found in West-Saxon, namely, the Imperative, occurs occasionally in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*. Of this use I have found the following seven examples; in each of which the infinitive is uninflected, and is active in sense as in form:—

Mk. 11.23[a,b]: soðlice ic cuoeð iuh ðætte suaha seðe cuoeðas ðissum more *genioma* & *senda* on sae = amen dico uobis quia quicumque dixerit huic monti *tollere* et *mittere* in mare. [W. S.: imperative subjunctive; Rushw.: *ginioma* & *sende* in sæ.]

L. I. 6.13[b]: foxas holo habbaþ getrymade esne fylgende *forgeafa uel forleta* ða deado & ðone haldond sulh ne eftlocia on bæc = uulpes foueas habere testatur iuuenis (*sic*) sequenti *dimittere* mortuos et tenentem aratrum non respicere retro. [Or Objective? Cook: *forgeafa,* inf.; *forleta,* inf.; *esne,* ns.; *fylgende,* not cited for this passage.]

L. 17.6[a,b]: gie cuoede ðisum tree i heartbreer *ofwyrtrumia* & *oferplontia uel gesette* on sæ & hersumiaþ iuh = diceritis huic arbori moro *eradicare* et *transplantare* in mare et obediret uobis. [W. S.: imperative subjunctive; Rushw.: imperative subjunctive; Cook: *ofwyrtrumia,* inf.; *oferplontia,* inf.]

L. 8.28: ic biddo ðec ne mec *ðrouiga uel* ðætte ðu mec ne gegroeta *uel* ne pinia = obsecro te ne me *torqueas.* [W. S.: ic halsige ðe ðæt *ðu* ne *ðreage* me; Rushw.: lacking. Possibly our infinitive is used Predicatively here? Cook: *ðrowiga,* infinitive; *gegroeta,* optative present, 2nd singular.]

J. 8.5: in æ uutudlice moises bebead us ðuslic *gestæna* ðu; forðon huæd cwæðes? = in lege autem moses mandauit nobis hujusmodi *lapidare tu;* ergo quid dicis? [W. S.: moyses us bebead on ðære æ ðæt we *sceoldon* ðus gerade mid stanum *oftorfian;*—Rushw.: bibeod us ðuslic nu *gistæna* ðu;—Cook: *gestæna,* infinitive.]

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

Two of the above examples of the Imperative Infinitive (*L.* I. 6.13[b] and *L.* 8.28), as there indicated, are doubtful; but the remaining five examples seem pretty certainly to belong here. And clearly these examples are due to the close following of the Latin original, in five of them (*Mk.* 11.23[a,b]; *L.* I. 6.13[b](?); *L.* 17.6[a,b]) to the too close following of the Latin, for we have the present infinitive translating a Latin passive of the imperative mood, which latter is identical in form with the Latin active infinitive. In *J.* 8.5, the Northumbrian imperative infinitive corresponds to the same idiom in Latin. In *L.* 8.28, the infinitive corresponds to a Latin jussive subjunctive.

For alleged examples of the Imperative Infinitive in West-Saxon, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* p. 6. For this construction in the kindred Germanic languages, see the same monograph, p. 264.

XV. SOME SUBSTITUTES FOR THE INFINITIVE

I. THE PREDICATE NOMINATIVE OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE FOR THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE AFTER VERBS OF MOTION

In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* I have not found any clear examples of the Predicate Nominative of the Present Participle used for the Predicative Infinitive after Verbs of Motion, as in the West-Saxon *He com fleogende* from *He com fleogan.* Two possible examples are the following:—*Mat.* 14.25: ðiu feorða uutedlice waccen næhtes *cuom* to him *geongende uel* geeode ofer sæ = quarta autem uigilia noctis *uenit* ad eos *ambulans* supra mare (Rushw. and W. S.: *ibidem*); *Mk.* I. 3.14: ðiu feorða næht wacan *cuom* to ðegnum *geongende* ofer *uel* bufa sæ = Quarta noctis uigilia *uenit* ad discipulos *ambulans* supra mare. But in each the participle may be used appositively instead of predicatively; and each has been put in the chapter on the Appositive Participle, p. 64 above.

Concerning this idiom in West-Saxon and in the other Germanic languages, see *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 221-224.

II. THE PREDICATE ACCUSATIVE OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE FOR THE PREDICATIVE INFINITIVE WITH ACCUSATIVE SUBJECT

About 94 (96 including the "Introductions") examples of the Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle instead of the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject occur in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to 80 in the *West-Saxon Gospels.*

The following are typical examples:—

Mk. 14.58[a]: forðon ue *geherdon hine* cwoedne *uel cwoeðende* = *audiuimus* eum *dicentem.*

Mat. 26.40: *gemoete hia slepende* = *inuenit eos dormientes.*—*Mat.* 20.6: *gemoette oðero stondende* = *inuenit alios stantes.*

Mat. 26.64[a,b]: gie *geseað sunu* monnes *sittenda . . .* & *cymmende* = *uidebitis filium* hominis *sedentem . . .* et *uenientem.*—*Mat.* 20.3: *gesæh oðero standende* in sprec *uel* in ðingstow = *uidit alios stantes* in foro.

Mat. 25.44[b,c]: huoenne *ðec* we *segon hyncgerende uel ðyrstanda?* = quando *te uidimus esurientem* aut *sitientem?*

The statistics of the Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle are in full as follows (96 in all, 2 in the "Introductions"):—

behalda, 'see' (1):
— *geongende,* 'going' (1): *J.* (1): 1.36.
forleta, 'dismiss' (2):
— *fæstende,* 'fasting' (2): *Mat.* (1): 15.32.—*Mk.* (1): 8.3.
gehera, 'hear' (6):
— *bifærende,* 'passing by' (1): *L.* (1): 18.36.
— *cuoeðende,* 'saying' (1): *Mk.* (1): 14.58[a].
— *forecwoedende,* 'preaching' (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 6.9.
— *huæstrende,* 'murmuring' (1): *J.* (1): 7.32.
— *soecende,* 'seeking' (1): *Mk.* (1): 12.28.
— *spreccende,* 'speaking' (1): *J.* (1): 1.37.
gemitta: see *gemoeta.*
gemoeta (*gemitta*), 'find' (20):
— *cymmende,* 'coming' (1): *Mat.* (1): 27.32.

— *doende,* 'doing' (1): *L.* (1): 12.43.
— *forbeadende,* 'forbidding' (1): *L.* (1): 23.2[d].
— *fraegnende,* 'enquiring' (1): *L.* (1): 2.46[c].
— *hæbbende,* 'having' (1): *J.* (1): 11.17.
— *herende,* 'hearing' (1): *L.* (1): 2.46[b].
— *liccende* (*licgende*), 'reclining' (1): *Mk.* (1): 7.30.
— *sittende,* 'sitting' (3): *L.* (2): 2.46[a]; 8.35[b].—*J.* (1): 2.14[a] (*sittendo*).
— *slepende,* 'sleeping' (6): *Mat.* (2): 26.40, 43.—*Mk.* (3): 13.36; 14.37, 40.—*L.* (1): 22.45.
— *stondende,* 'standing' (2): *Mat.* (1): 20.6.—*L.* (1): 19.32.
— *undercerrende,* 'subverting' (1): *L.* (1): 23.2[c].
— *wæccendo,* 'watching' (1): *L.* (1): 12.37[a].

gesea, 'see' (59):
— *aworpende,* 'casting out' (1): *L.* (1): 9.49.
— *clioppende,* 'crying out' (1): *Mat.* (1): 21.15[a].
— *cuacende,* 'having fever' (1): *Mat.* (1): 8.14[b].
— *cueðendo* (*sic* for *cueðendo*), 'speaking' (1): *Mat.* (1): 21.15[b].
— *cum(m)ende* (*cym(m)ende*), 'coming' (11): *Mat.* (4): I. 20.6; 16.28; 24.30; 26.64[b].—*Mk.* (3): 9.1; 13.26; 14.62[b].—*L.* (1): 21.27.—*J.* (3): 1.29, 47; 10.12.
— *cym(m)ende:* see *cum(m)ende.*
— *fallende,* 'falling' (1): *L.* (1): 10.18.
— *fylgendi* (*-do*), 'following' (2): *J.* (2): 1.38 (*-ndo*); 21.20 (*-ndi*).
— *geongende,* 'going,' 'walking' (6): *Mat.* (2): 14.26.[a]; 15.31.—*Mk.* (3): 6.3, 49; 8.24.—*J.* (1): 6.19.
— *licgende* (*liccende*), 'lying down' (2): *Mat.* (1): 8.14[a] (*liccende*).—*J.* (1): 5.6.
— *mænende* (*mæniende*), 'mourning' (2): *Mat.* (1): 9.23.—*Mk.* (1): 5.38[b] (*mæniende*).
— *ofdunestigende,* 'descending' (1): *J.* (1): 1.51[b].
— *ofstigende,* 'descending' (1): *Mk.* (1): 1.10[b].
— *sendende,* 'casting' (2): *Mk.* (1): 1.16[b].—*L.* (1): 21.2.

— *sittende,* 'sitting' (9): *Mat.* (2): 9.9; 26.64[a] (*-nda*).—*Mk.* (4): 2.14; 5.15[a]; 14.62[a]; 16.5[a].—*L.* (2): 5.27; 22.56.—*J.* (1): 20.12 (*sittendæ*).

— *standende:* see *stondende.*

— *stigende,* 'descending' (4): *Mat.* (1): 3.16[a].—*J.* (3): 1.32, 33[b]; 6.62.

— *stondende* (*standende*), 'standing' (5): *Mat.* (1): 20.3.—*Mk.* (1): 13.14.—*L.* (1): 5.2 (*-ndo*).—*J.* (2): 19.26; 20.14.

— *up(p)stigende,* 'ascending' (2): *L.* (1): 12.54.—*J.* (1): 1.51[a].

— *ðringende,* 'pressing upon' (1): *Mk.* (1): 5.31.

— *wærmigende,* 'warming' (1): *Mk.* (1): 14.67.

— *woepende,* 'weeping' (1): *Mk.* (1): 5.38[a].

— *wunigende,* 'remaining' (2): *Mk.* (1): 1.10[c].—*J.* (1): 1.33[c].

— *wynnende* (*winnende*), 'laboring' (1): *Mk.* (1): 6.48[a].

— *wyrcende,* 'doing' (1): *J.* (1): 5.19.

habba, 'have' (1):

— *uuniande,* 'abiding' (1): *J.* (1): 5.38.

infinda, *find* (1):

— *restende,* 'resting,' 'lying vacant' (1): *Mat.* (1): 12.44.

onfinda, 'find' (1):

— *doende,* 'doing' (1): *Mat.* (1): 24.46.

sea, 'see' (5):

— *hremende,* 'weeping' (1): *J.* (1): 11.33.

— *hyncgerende:* see *hyngrende.*

— *hyngrende* (*hyncgerende*), 'hungering' (2): *Mat.* (2): 25.37[a], 44[b] (*hyncgerende*).

— *ðyrstende,* 'thirsting' (2): *Mat.* (2): 25.37[b], 44[c] (*ðyrstenda*).

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

In all the 96 examples except two, the Northumbrian Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle translates the same idiom of the Latin; in the two exceptional cases, it translates a Latin adjective in the predicate accusative. The two exceptions

are as follows:—*Mat.* 15.32: *forlette hia fœstende* nwill (*sic*) ic = *dimittere* eos *ieiunios* nolo; *Mk.* 8.3: gif ic *forleto hia fœstende* in hus = *si dimisero eos ieiunios* in domum. Moreover, the general dislike of the Northumbrian for the participle with verbal force is shown in the avoidance, by the Lindisfarne glossator, of the predicative accusative of the participle even when the idiom occurs in the Latin original, as in his awkward rendition, in *Mat.* 15.31[a,b], of the participle by a finite verb: sua ðæt ðreatas wundradun gesegon monigo *gesprecon* halto geeadon *uel* geongende blindo *gesegon uel geseas* = ita ut turbae mirarentur uidentes multos (*sic*) *loquentes* clodos ambulantes caecos *uidentes.* The evidence, therefore, of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* tends to confirm the conclusion reached from a study of this idiom in West-Saxon, namely, that the predicative use of the accusative of the present participle was not a native idiom in English or in the Germanic languages as a whole, and that the substitution of the predicate accusative of the present participle for the predicative infinitive was due to Latin influence. See *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 225-230.

III. THE ELLIPTICAL ACCUSATIVE-WITH-INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTION

A. *Made up of an Accusative Plus a Present Participle*

Somewhat different from the preceding idiom is what for lack of a better name I should denominate the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction. This idiom is made up usually of an Accusative Plus a Present Participle, and translates a Latin elliptical accusative-with-infinitive construction consisting either (*a*) of an accusative plus a future participle without *esse* or, more frequently, (*b*) of an accusative plus a gerundive without *esse.* In the idiom considered in the preceding section, the principal verbs are usually verbs of sense perception and occasionally verbs of mental perception; and the participle translates almost invariably a Latin predicative present participle. In the present idiom, the principal verbs are usually verbs of commanding or of declaring, never verbs of

sense perception; and the participle translates, not a Latin present participle, but a Latin future participle or, usually, a Latin gerundive. Of course, when translating the Latin gerundive, in (*b*), the Lindisfarne participle, though active in form, is passive in sense. I cite all the clearer examples observed of the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction of each of these two types:—

(*a*) (8 examples, all in the "Introductions"):—

bebeada, *command, urge* (1): *L.* (1): I. 8.17: geddung . . . setteð . . . *bebead* ðæt *gefea* from hreownisum hælo *tocymende* = parabolam . . . ponit . . . *commendans gaudium* de paenitentum salute *futurum.*

forecuoeða, *announce, predict* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.16: *hine tocymende* on wolcen . . . *forecuoeð* = *s*eque *uenturum* in nube . . . *praedicit.*

foresægca, *announce, declare, prophesy* (3): *Mat.* (2): I. 20.4: *geðrouende hine foresægde* = *Passurum se prænuntians;* I. 20.20ª.—*L.* (1): I. 6.6.

gehata, *promise* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.1ᵇ: ða iudeas of ric in ðon *cynna geheht tocymmende* sægeð fordrifena = iudaeos de regno in quo *gentes promittit uenturas* asserit expellendos.

geondwearda, *respond, answer* (1): *L.* (1): I. 9.10ª: wæs frægnend from tid rices godes *geonduearde* ne mið gehald *tocymende* = Interrogatus de tempore regni dei *respondit* non cum obseruatione *uenturum* (the subject accusative is to be supplied both in the Northumbrian gloss and in the Latin original).

soðsægca, *declare* (1): *J.* (1): I. 6.16ª: *corn* huætes dead monigfald uæstem *soðsæges tobrengende* embehtande = *granum* frumenti mortuum multum fructum *pronuntiat allaturum* ministrantem.

(*b*) (11 examples, all in the "Introductions"):—

beada, *command, order* (1): *J.* (1): I. 8.11: & *foedendo* ða *scipo* gelic ðirdæ *beadande* . . . tahte etc. = et *pascendas oues* æque tertio *commendans* . . . significat ei quod etc.(?).

cuoeða, *say, declare* (2): *L.* (2): I. 5.17ᵇ: & *ða* ðæt moder & broðro *ceigendo cuoeð* = et *eos* matrem fratresque *uocandos*

ait; I. 9.10[b]: *niomande* hia *cuoeð menn* = *occupandos* eos *dicit homines.*

forecuoeða, *predict* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.14[a]: ec *forecueð hine slaende* = Item *praedicens se occidendum.*

foresæcga, *declare, predict* (2): *Mat.* (1): I. 22.4: *foresægeð* eastro æfter tuæm dogrum & *hine sellende* = *Praenuntiat* pascha post biduum *seque tradendum.—Mk.* (1): I. 4.14[a].

geonduearda, *respond* (1): *L.* (1): I. 10.14[b]: *geonduærde* yflo monigo forescyniga ne *foresmeande huæd* gesald gescprecen weron = *respondit* mala plurima praecessura nec *praecogitandum quid* traditi loquantur.

læra, *teach* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 17.10 (1): ne *bisignisse* mettes & woedes *hæbende* ah ric godes allum fore — [= blank] *læras* = nec *sollicitudinem* escæ et uestis *habendam* sed regnum dei omnibus præferendum *docet.*

ðerhgebidda, *persuade* (3): *L.* (3): I. 7.4[a,b,c]: frionde ðrio hlafas æd middernæht ðam biddende ðæt getdung sette *giwende, soecende,* & *cnylsende ðerhgebiddes* = Amici tres panes media nocte petiti parabolam ponens *petendum, quaerendum, pulsandumque persuadit.*

B. *Made up of an Accusative Plus a Preterite Participle*

Again, we find a few examples (about 8 in all) of an Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction made up of an Accusative Plus a Preterite Participle and translating a Latin Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction consisting (*a*) usually (six times) of an accusative plus a gerundive without *esse* and (*b*) twice of an accusative plus a past participle. In sense this locution is passive, of course. The examples in full are as follows:—

(*a*) (6 examples, all in the "Introductions"):—

bebeada, *command, exhort* (1): *L.* (1): I. 6.20[b]: inlædeð geddung ðæs wundes ðæm gebroht from samaritanum *mildheortnise bebead gebisened* = inducit parabolam uulnerati cui conlatam a samaritano *misericordiam praecipit imitandam.*

forebeada, *forbid, prohibit* (1): *Mk.* (1): I. 4.15[b]: *haedno forebeadend gelicad uel* gebis hersumnise mið bisene ædeawed = *gentiles prohibens imitandos* humilitatis exemplo monstrato.

foresægca, *announce, declare* (2): *L.* (2): I. 10.2[a]: *fiondas* rices his *foresægeð ðerhgelicade* = *inimicos* regni sui *pronuntiat perimendos;* I. 10.4: gesæh ða ceastra gewæp ofer hia *foresægde ofacerred* = Uidens ciuitatem fleuit super eam *praenuntians euertendam* (in Northumbrian and in Latin the subject accusative is to be supplied from the context).

gelæra, *teach* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 16.14[c]: *gelaeres soðfeastnisse ofersuiðed* = *docet iustitiam superandam.*

sægca, *say, declare* (1): *Mat.* (1): I. 18.1[c]: ða *iudeas* of ric in ðon cynna geheht tocymmende *sægeð fordrifena* = *iudaeos* de regno in quo gentes promittit uenturas *asserit expellendos.*

(*b*) (2 examples):

sægca, *say, declare* (2): *Mk.* (2): I. 1.6[b], 7: in stefne engles *sægcende gesended* ne ðæt ane *word* lichoma geworden ah lichoma drihtes ðerh word godcundes stefn *gesaweled* = in uoce angeli *enuntiantis emissum* non solum *uerbum* caro factum sed corpus domini per uerbum diuinæ uocis *animatum.*

ORIGIN OF THE IDIOM

It seems clear that the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, especially type A, made up of an Accusative Plus a Present Participle, arises from the very close translation of the Latin original. I am inclined to believe, too, that type B of this construction, made up of an Accusative Plus a Past Participle, is likewise due to the imitation of the Latin idiom, though some may prefer to consider it as merely a sub-variety of the native accusative plus a predicative past participle. Of neither of these two major types of the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, have I found a clear example in West-Saxon.

NOTES

1. *The Elliptical Accusative-With-Infinitive Construction Consists of an Accusative Plus a Past Participle That Is Active in Sense,* and translates a Latin accusative plus a perfect active infinitive in *J.* 12.18: forða *uel* foreðon & ongægn *uel* togægnes cuom him ðe here forðon *uel* ðætte *geherdon hine geuorhto* ðis becon = propterea et obuiam uenit ei turba quia *audierunt eum fecisse* hoc signum.

2. *The Lindisfarne Present Participle Corresponds, not to a Latin Future Participle, but to the Perfect Participle of a Deponent Verb* in *Mk.* I. 4.5: *iohannis* — (= blank) weron ðrowende he gelicra *ðrowende cuoeð* = et *iohannem* heliae passuri ipse similia *passum dicit.*

3. *An Abortive Attempt at the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction* occurs in the passage below, in which the failure seems to arise from the glossator's misunderstanding of *fore: L.* I. 6.9: efter sona *cuoeð hine ðrouande were toweard* = Iterum dicit *se passurum fore.*

4. *Apparent Examples of the Predicative Present Participle in a Passive Sense.*—In his "Development of the Progressive Form in Germanic" (in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America,* XXVIII, 1913, pp. 182-183), Professor G. O. Curme holds that, in the following passages of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the Predicative Present Participle is used in a Passive Sense:—*Matthew* 13.19, 20: eghuelc seðe heres word rices & ne oncneawu *uel* ne ongæt, cuom ðe ðiowl *uel* ðe yfle & genom *uel* gelahte ðæt gesawen wæs in hearta is, ðes is *uel* wæs seðe neh strete *uel* woeg *sawende wæs;* seðe soðlice ofer *uel* on staener *sawende wæs,* ðis is *uel* wæs seðe word geherde etc. = omnis qui audit uerbum regni et non intellegit, uenit malus et rapit quod seminatum est in corde eius, hic est qui secus uiam *seminatus est;* qui autem supra petrosa *seminatus est,* hic est qui uerbum audit etc.; *Mat.* 13.22: seðe uutedlice *wæs sawænde* in ðornum, ðes *uel* ðis is seðe word heres etc. = qui autem *est seminatus* in spinis, hic est qui uerbum audit etc.; *Mat.* 13.23: seðe uutedlice in eorðo godo *sa-*

wende wæs, ðis is *uel* wæs seðe heres word etc. = qui uero in terra bona *seminatus est,* hic est qui audit uerbum etc.; *Luke* 7.12: heono dead *wæs ferende* sunu ancende moderes his = ecce defunctus *efferebatur* filius unicus matris suae. The *West-Saxon Gospels* has the past participle in all of these examples, as has the *Rushworth Gospels* in all except in the example from *Luke,* which latter is lacking therein. Professor Curme may be right in contending that the present participle in the five examples of the predicative use just quoted is passive in sense; for, as we have seen, occasionally we find a present absolute or a present appositive participle of the *Lindisfarne Gospels* translating a Latin passive participle: see pp. 5, 6, and 86 above. As there indicated, the present absolute and the present appositive participles seem due to an oversight. I think it more probable, however, that in the first four examples just quoted the participle is active in sense. The glossator, seeing that the Latin verb has a personal subject, considers that the subject of *sawende wæs* is literally the sower, not symbolically the sower standing for the seed; for, where the subject of the Latin verb is unmistakably impersonal, standing for the seed or the word, the Lindisfarne glossator uses the passive participle, as in *Mat.* 13.19 above (word . . . *ðæt gesawen wæs* = uerbum . . . *quod seminatum est*). Compare, further, *Mk.* 4.15[a,b] (ðær *bið gesauen word* . . . word *ðætte gesawen wæs* = ubi *seminatur uerbum* . . . uerbum *quod seminatum est*), in which we have a Lindisfarne impersonal subject and a passive participle translating a Latin impersonal subject and a passive verb, with *Mk.* 4.16 (ðas sint gelic *ðaðe* ofer stænero *saues uel sauað* = hi sunt similiter *qui* super petrosa *seminantur*) and *Mk.* 4.18 (oðero sint *ðaðe* on ðornum hia *saueð uel sanas* = alii sunt *qui* in spinis *seminantur*), in which we have a Lindisfarne personal subject and an active finite verb translating a Latin personal subject and a passive finite verb. In *Mk.* 4.20 (ða sint *ðaðe* ofer eorðo god *gesauen sint* = hi sunt *qui* super terram bonam *seminati sunt*), however, we have a Lindisfarne personal subject and a passive participle translating a Latin personal subject and

a passive finite verb made up of the verb *to be* plus the passive participle: possibly the frequency of the Latin expression finally overrules the glossator's original interpretation? As to *L.* 7.12, quoted above, the present participle may be due in part to the proximity of the perfect participle (*defunctus*) of a deponent verb to *efferebatur,* since, in West-Saxon and in Northumbrian, Latin deponent verbs are often translated by the progressive tense. But, in the following example, which is not mentioned by Professor Curme, there is no such excuse for the error, real or apparent:—*L.* I. 9.9: *wæs fregnend* from tid rices godes geonduearde ne mið gehald tocymende = *Interrogatus* de tempore regni dei respondit non cum obseruatione uenturum.

APPENDIX IX

GERMANIC ANALOGUES TO THE NORTHUMBRIAN ELLIPTICAL ACCUSATIVE-WITH-INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTION

In the Scandinavian Languages we find an instructive parallel to the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, of which parallel, however, I did not become fully aware until after I had written the preceding part of this section, when I secured a copy of Professor Nygaard's "Om Brugen af det Saakaldte Præsens Particip i Oldnorsk (1879)," to which article I have several times referred already in other parts of the present study. Concerning the idiom about to be discussed, I had read brief statements in the treatises on Scandinavian syntax by Lund (§154), by Falk and Torp (§138), and by Nygaard himself in his *Norrøn Syntax* (§§238-242), but I did not realize the closeness of the parallel until I had read Professor Nygaard's aforementioned essay on the Present Participle in Old Norse.

On pp. 219 ff. of this essay, Professor Nygaard tells us that, in later and learned Old Norse works, the Present Participle is at times used Predicatively [37] in a Passive Sense with *vera* to denote suitability, obligation, or necessity, as in *Hom.* 9.6: sja

[37] Occasionally also attributively.

friðr *er haldandi* með goðum (*custodienda est*); *Hom.* 28.18: þat *er vitanda* mildlegt verk vist (*sciendum est* esse pietatis opus). He tells us, what is apparent from the examples just given, that the Norse idiom corresponds closely to the Latin passive periphrastic conjugation; and that it is, as a rule, found only in the writings that show Latin influence. The statement is of so great importance and the essay is so difficult to get hold of that I must quote Professor Nygaard's own words (pp. 219 ff.):—

"I passiv betydning betegner præs. part. 'som er at gjøre' d. e. 'som egner sig til at behandles eller til at blive gjenstand for en vis virksomhed.' Det udtrykker saaledes dels *skikkethed* eller *værdighed* (*bekvem, skikket* til at—, *værdig, kvalificeret* til at—) dels *mulighed* (som lader sig behandle, kan behandles) dels *tilbørlighed* og nødvendighed (som fortjener at behandles, bør, maa behandles).

"Den passive betydning hører hjemme i *transitive* verber og findes baade i *prædicering* og i *attributiv* stilling, men har *overhovedet ikke nogen udstrakt anvendelse.*

"Navnlig er det passive præsensparticip meget sjeldent som attribut, og hyppigst bruges det i forbindelse med verbet *vera* forat betegne, at en handling bør eller maa ske (er tilbørlig eller nødvendig). Denne forbindelse svarer til den latinske saakaldte omskrivende konjugation i passiv, og anvendes ogsaa fortrinsvis i saadanne skrifter, hvor latinsk paavirkning er kjendelig.

"Hvor participipiet er prædikatsord, er subjektet, og hvor det er attribut, det substantiv, hvortil det er føiet, en person eller ting, som i aktiv er gjenstand for verbets virksomhed. Det logiske subjekt sættes i dativ.

. . .

"Sjelden bruges det passive part. upersonligt med *vera: er* fra hanum ekki lengra *segjandi* (*Str.* 35.38).

. . .

"Af *intransitive* verber kan neutrum af participiet bruges i passiv betydning med verbet *vera* som et upersonligt udtryk, og

dertil kan føies den styrelse, hvormed verbet forbindes i aktiv: slikt hit sama *er rennandi* (*currendum est*) með sannri van til hugganar yfirlegrar mildi (*Hom.* 7. 2); allra hluta fyrst *er* manni *leitandi* (*quaerendum est* homini) hvat se sönn speki (*Hom.* 3, 6). . .

" Ganske enkeltvis findes et lignende upersonligt udtryk *af transitive verber med tilføiet objekt i akkusativ:* i hvern tima *gefanda er* hverja gjöf (*Kgs.* 170.7);" etc.

On p. 225, Professor Nygaard gives some interesting statistics as to the relative infrequency of the present participle (whether with or without an object and whether active or passive in sense) in the earlier and more original Old Norse works. He states that not a single example of the present participle with a passive sense is found in the *Elder Edda.*

Still later, on p. 227, Professor Nygaard takes up the question as to the origin of the use of the present participle in a passive sense in Old Norse. Recalling his statement that no example of this idiom is found in the *Elder Edda,* and that the construction appears chiefly in translations from the Latin or in imitations of Latin works, I expected him to say what all of his evidence seemed to make probable if not inevitable, namely, that the construction is due to Latin influence. But not so; here is his to me surprizing answer: " Men hvorledes er de to forskjellige betydninger, den aktive og den passive, at stille til hinanden? er den sidste yngre end den første, og naar er den isaafald opstaaet? Derom er det vanskeligt at udtale sig med bestemthed. Vistnok forholder det sig, som paapeget, saa, at den passive brug ikke forekommer i den ældre edda, medens den f. ex. i ' Kongespeilet ' er temmelig almindelig. Deraf tør man dog ikke slutte, at den først er udviklet i en senere tid og slet ikke fandtes paa det sprogtrin, der repræsenteres af edda. Rimeligvis er den gammel, men har i tidligere tider været endnu mere tilbagetrædende i forhold til den aktive brug, end den senere blev. Men det synes at være sikkert, at de to betydninger ikke er lige oprindelige i alle slags verber, at de tværtimod fra først af har været knyttede til hver sin gruppe. Det

samme suffix har, føiet til verbalstammen, af *intransitive* verber dannet et *aktivt* verbaladjektiv og af *transitive* verber et *passivt*. Saaledes er jo ogsaa tilfældet med det andet verbaladjektiv, det saakaldte fortidsparticip, at de samme suffixer i intransitive verber frembringer begrebet: 'indtraadt i en vis stilling eller tilstand' (aktivt), og i transitive: 'bragt i en vis stilling eller tilstand, paavirket, behandlet' (passivt). Det aktive particip har endvidere fra først af havt sin anvendelse i apposition og som attribut, ikke i prædicering, medens det passive fortrinsvis er benyttet i den sidste stilling. Senere er dette forhold forrykket, idet ogsaa *transitive* verber danner part. med aktiv betydning (meget sjelden faar man derimod omvendt passive part. af intransitive verber), saaat altsaa begge betydninger kan findes ved siden af hinanden i samme ord. Disse aktive participier af trans. verber bruges først som *substantiver* til at betegne den handlende person, siden ogsaa adjektivisk. Samtidig dermed er man ogsaa begyndt at anvende det aktive part. i prædicering. Allersidst opstaar enkelte reflexiv-formede nutidsparticiper (*sic*) med reflexiv eller passiv betydning."

Whether, in his more recent and brief treatment of the present participle with a passive meaning, given twenty-seven years later in his *Norrøn Syntax* (Kristiania, 1906), Professor Nygaard still holds to the same view as to the origin of this construction in the Scandinavian languages, it is difficult to determine from his statements. To me, however, the later statements seem somewhat more favorable to the theory of Latin influence than do the earlier ones. Of the present participle with passive signification he says, in §239 of his *Norrøn Syntax:* "Som prædikatsord føies det i F. S.[38] ikke ganske sjelden især til *vera*. . . . Hyppigere bruges det saaledes i L. S.[38] Navnlig bruges her meget ofte dette passive[39] part. i forb. med *vera* som en omskrivning for at betegne, at en handling

[38] F. S. = Folkelig Stil, 'popular style'; and L. S. = Lærd Stil, 'learned style.'

[39] He means the present participle used in a passive sense, both here and in my next quotation.

bør, maa, kan ske (er tilbørlig, nødvendig, mulig) i lighed med den latinske omskrivende konjugation i passiv." And in his summary concerning the present participle, he says, among other things, in § 242: "Det oprindelige forhold med hensyn til præs. part. synes altsaa at have været: præs. part. af intransitive verber har aktiv, af transitive passiv betydning; de første bruges i apposition og som attribut, sjelden i prædicering; de sidste, som idethele er lidet hyppige, saagodtsom udelukkende som prædikatsord; præs. part. er i det væsentlige at betragte som adjektiver; de har ingen fremtrædende tidsbetydning og har nominal styrelse (genitiv).

"Saaledes vedbliver ogsaa idethele sprogbrugen at være i F. S.

"I L. S. udvides og modificeres brugen ved paavirkning af fremmede analogier, navnlig det latinske nutidsparticip og passive verbaladjektiv.

"Det aktive part. dannes her ogsaa af transitive verber og faar verbal karakter (med tydelig tidsbetydning og verbal styrelse).

"Det passive part. bruges i forb. med *vera* hyppig som et omskrevet udtryk om pligt, nødvendighed eller mulighed (i lighed med latinsk omskrivende konjugation i passiv)."

Possibly Professor Nygaard's position is this: the passive use of the present participle was a native Germanic construction, but its use was extended by Latin influence. To me, however, it seems more probable that, in Old Norse as in Northumbrian, the idiom owes its origin to the Latin. This view gains in probability, I think, if we recall that in several other constructions, notably in the absolute use of the dative and in the appositive use of the present participle governing an accusative object, Old Norse, according to Professor Nygaard himself, was a direct borrower from the Latin, as was Old English also.

Professor Heusler calls the passive use of the present participle its gerundive use, and seems to consider that this idiom is not of native origin. See § 423 of his *Altisländisches Elementarbuch* (Heidelberg, 1913), which runs as follows:—

"Von dem Gesagten [40] sind auch in der heimischen Prosa ausgenommen:

"1. Die *substantivierten* Partt., die namentlich in der Rechtssprache beliebt sind; sie werden auch von Transitiva gebildet: *veriande* 'Verteidiger,' *teliendr* 'die Herzähler.'

"Die Partt. mit *gerundiver* Bedeutung, meistens prädikative: *er þer þess ekke biþianda* 'dir ist nicht darum zu bitten (die Bitte steht dir nicht an)'; *þeim hǫfþingia, er mer se eigande vinatta viþ* 'einem Häuptling, mit dem es sich mir verlohnte Freundschaft zu haben.' Selten attributiv: *skogarmaþr feriande* 'ein führbarer (einschiffbarer) Waldmann.'"

On the other hand, Professor H. Logeman, in an instructive article entitled "Det Saakaldte Passive Nutidsparticip i Norsk og i Beslægtede Sprog," published in the *Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi,* XXX, 1913-1914, pp. 17-42, takes a somewhat different view of the idiom that I have been discussing. He holds that, in the Scandinavian examples of the sort that I have quoted from Nygaard, we have in reality, not a present participle used in a passive sense, but a modified form of the infinitive, the *d* in *-nde* having been, he thinks, developed from a hypothetical inflected infinitive very much as in the High German Gerund, or Present Participle of Necessity; and that, in this supposed phonetic development in the Scandinavian languages, there is no sure ground for assuming outside influence either from the Latin or from the German. For this assumed native origin of the so-called present participle in a passive sense, in the Scandinavian languages, Professor Logeman offers interesting, but, to me, not convincing arguments. In particular, his assumption that the Scandinavian languages once had an inflected infinitive, seems to me not supported by sufficient evidence. But whether the Scandinavian *-nde* in a passive sense, as in the examples from Nygaard, was originally a participial form or a new formation from a hypothetical inflected infinitive in *-enne,* I must hold, contrary to Professor Logeman, that the Latin [40a] influ-

[40] The reference here is to his § 422, which I have quoted in full on pp. 56-57 above.

ence was primary, and that the phonetic [40a] influence, if it existed at all, was secondary. Otherwise I cannot account for the fact, vouched for by Professor Nygaard, that in the Scandinavian languages the *-nde* form in a passive sense occurs first in, and is restricted almost solely to, translations from the Latin. This conviction as to the Latin origin of the Old Norse present participle in a passive sense is strengthened by a consideration of the kindred idiom of the Swedish language discussed in my next paragraph.

Another Scandinavian analogue to the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction is found in the Middle Swedish use of a present participle in a passive sense, which Professor Adolf Noreen tells us was due to Latin influence. Of this idiom Professor Noreen speaks as follows in his *Geschichte der Nordischen Sprachen Besonders in Altnordischer Zeit,* 3d ed., Strassburg, 1913, § 274: "Ein Participium Futuri activi und passivi wird bisweilen im Altschwedischen seit um 1350 (bes. aber mschw.) zur Wiedergabe der lateinischen Bildungen auf *-urus* und *-ndus* geschaffen und zwar durch Zusammensetzung des Infinitivs mit dem Part. Präs. *skolande* 'werdend,' 'sollend,' z. B. *komaskolande* 'venturus,' *dyrkaskolande* 'venerandus.' Wahrscheinlich sind diese Formen, die offenbar dem Lateinischen nachgebildet sind und bald wieder schwinden, nie in die gesprochene Sprache eingedrungen."

[40a] Concerning the genesis of the *-ende* form preceded by *to* in Old English, Dr. Logeman makes a statement in the article under discussion, pp. 28-29, and in his "Introduction" to *The Rule of St. Benet* (London, 1889), §§ 89-92. He holds that this Old English form, by some called the Participle of Necessity, was due primarily to phonetic influence and only secondarily, if at all, to Latin influence. Accordingly he disapproves of the statement of Professor Eduard Sievers (in his *Angelsächsische Grammatik,* 3d ed., Halle, 1898, § 350, Anm.), who considers that the Old English development in question is due primarily to Latin influence. Neither of these scholars refers to what I have denominated the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, but Professor Sievers does state that occasionally in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* a Latin gerundive is rendered by a pure present participle instead of the participle of necessity, which latter is made up of *to* plus the form in *-nde,* as *to donde* = *faciendus.*

In High German, also, we find a construction somewhat akin to the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction. In the New High German Gerund, or, as some prefer to call it, the Participle of Necessity, we have, as is well known, a present participle that is preceded by *zu,* that is used attributively only, and that is passive in sense, as in *ein nicht zu übersehender Umstand,* 'a circumstance not to be overlooked.' In his *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Gerundivs im Deutschen,* a Heidelberg dissertation of 1909, Dr. Victor Eckert has summarized the several divergent views held by the grammarians as to the origin of the Gerund in German. Despite Dr. Eckert's opinion to the contrary, it seems to me that the theory stated by the late Professor W. Wilmanns is most likely to prove the correct one. This theory is perhaps most succinctly stated in his *Deutsche Grammatik* (Strassburg, 1896), III, § 385, which runs as follows: "Nicht selten verbinden wir den Infinitiv mit *zu* mit dem Verbum Substantivum,[41] z. B. 'der Schritt war nicht zu vermeiden. Besserung ist kaum zu hoffen. Die Handlung ist zu loben.' Im Gotischen begegnet diese Construction nicht, häufig im Ahd. Sie entspricht wesentlich dem lat. Gerundium und breitet sich wohl auch unter dem Einfluss des Gerundiums aus; z. B. *ze karawenne sint* praeparanda sunt; *ze kesezzenne ist* constituenda est; *sindun zi chilaubanne* credendi sunt. Seit dem 12. Jahr. fängt dieser Infinitiv an, die Endung *-ende* anzunehmen, zuerst im Md., dann auch im Alemannischen (Whd. § 372. 400) und in dieser mit dem Participium Präs. übereinstimmenden Form ist im Nhd. der Infinitiv aus seiner prädicativen Stellung in attributiven Gebrauch übergegangen, so dass er zu einem Participium necessitatis geworden ist, das jedoch auf den attributiven Gebrauch beschränkt bleibt., z. B. 'die noch zu besetzenden Stellen, ein nicht zu unterschätzender Gegner, eine kaum zu erwartende Wendung, hochzuverehrender Herr,' aber 'die

[41] How the Infinitive with *zu* came to denote necessity is discussed by Wilmanns in the third volume of his *Deutsche Grammatik* (Strassburg, 1906), § 70, 6, and more at length by the present writer in *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon,* pp. 200-203, 239-240.

Stellen sind noch zu besetzen, der Gegner ist nicht zu unterschätzen' etc. Geschmackvolle Darstellung geht diesen Formen noch gern aus dem Wege; oft stehen statt ihrer Verbaladjectiva auf *-lich* zu Gebote. Gr. 4, 66. 113. Heyse 1, 692 f." Wilmanns returns to the question in the third volume of his *Deutsche Grammatik* (Strassburg, 1906), § 31, 2, which section, though in part identical with what I have just quoted, deserves quotation here because of some additional information conveyed therein: "Das Part. Präs. fällt durch Assimilation des *-nd* und Apokope des auslautenden *e* (*-ende* > *ene,* > *-en*) vielfach mit dem Infinitiv zusammen [42]). Auch diese Entartung begegnet zuerst im Ndd. und Md., (einmal schon im Arnsteiner Marienleich MSD. 38, 236), wurde dann aber in manchen Verbindungen, in denen man das Part. als selbständiges Satzglied nicht mehr fühlte, von der Schriftsprache angenommen (§ 61).

"Umgekehrt nahm der Infinitiv mit *zu* die Endung des Partizipiums an und ging als ein Part. necessitatis in attributiven Gebrauch über (*ein nicht zu übersehender Umstand* u. dgl.). Die Berührung mit dem lat. Gerundium, das schon in der Benediktiner-Regel einmal durch diese Form wiedergegeben wird (Hattemer 98, 2 *nuntianda* = *ze chundande*), wird die Entwickelung unterstützt haben. S. II, § 385. Erdmann § 137."

This explanation of the Gerund offered by Wilmanns is substantially concurred in by Oskar Erdmann, in his *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax* (Stuttgart, 1886), I, § 137; by Friedrich Blatz, in his *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik,* 3rd ed. (Karlsruhe, 1896), II, § 160, a. 2; and by Professor Otto Behaghel,[43] in his *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache,* 3rd ed. (in Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie,* Strassburg, 1911), p. 184.

But, whatever may be the final decision as to the precise origin of the High German Gerund, the Gerund certainly has

[42] "Mit besonderem Fleiss, aber nicht überall mit richtiger Beurteilung hat Bech diese Erscheinung verfolgt. ZfdW. 1, 81."

[43] Professor Behaghel, *l. c.*, p. 184, gives substantially the same explanation of the confusion of the forms of the present participle and of the infinitive in German as does Wilmanns, but of the Gerund itself he does not speak specifically.

several points of striking similarity with the Northumbrian Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction: a form of the present participle has a passive [44] signification in High German and in Northumbrian; confusion of participle and of inflected infinitive forms (however brought about) occurs in High German and in Northumbrian; and the inflected infinitive of necessity in Northumbrian and the prepositional infinitive of necessity in High German, from which latter probably was developed the Participle of Necessity, or the Gerund, in High German, were each probably suggested by the presence of the gerund in the Latin originals.

Of interest in this connection is Dr. J. A. H. Murray's statement concerning the passive of action in Scotch, in his *The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland,* London, 1873, p. 225: "To express the Passive of action, equal to the Latin *ædificatur, ædificabatur, ædificabitur,* the Scotch uses the form *the hoose is buildan.*' This is not a contraction of the Old Eng. *a-building,* as the form is not the gerund but the participle, and represents the middle voice *buildan' itsel',* and thus *being built.* But as this form, being identical with the Active voice, would often cause ambiguity, it is usual in Scotch, as in French, to make such sentences active, with the indefinite Nominative *thay,* pronounced (dh), *Fr.* on. Thus, 'many houses are at present being built here,' would be rendered 'The're buildan' monie hooses heir the-nuw.'"

To consider the Modern English *is doing* in the sense of *is being done* would take us too far afield. An interesting discussion of the divergent views concerning the origin of this idiom, however, is given by Dr. Alfred Akerlund, "A Word on the Passive Definite Tenses," in *Englische Studien,* XLVII, 1914, pp. 321-337.

[44] To speak of the alleged instances of a Germanic present participle in a passive sense other than in the gerundial combination would carry us too far afield. On this point see Grimm, *l. c.,* IV, p. 68; Wilmanns, *l. c.,* III, §58; Erdmann, *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax,* I, § 132; and Blatz, *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik,* II, § 161, a. 4.

NOTES

PASSAGES IN WHICH AN INFINITIVE IS USED UNALLOWABLY IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

I gather together here several passages in which an Infinitive Is Used Unallowably in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*:—

1. *The Uninflected Infinitive*

Mk. 3.2: ðætte hia geteldon *uel niðria* hine = ut *accusarent* illum (Rushw.: ðæt hiæ teldun *uel niðradun* hine; W. S.: ðæt hi hine *gewregdun*). [Here, clearly, the glossator merely names by the infinitive form a word synonymous with *geteldon* without going further and putting the word in the proper form of the finite verb.]

J. I. 1.3: ðone of hændum *uel* of brydlopum ðæt lust uifes *gemana* eftgeceigde god = quem de nuptis *uoluntem* (*sic* for *uolentem?*) *nubere* reuocauit deus. [The glossator seems to misunderstand *uoluntem* for *uoluntatem* instead of *uolentem*, and leaves *gemana* without a governing verb.]

2. *The Inflected Infinitive*

Mat. I. 20.5[a]: alle willo *to fylgenna* hine læreð onsaca hine seolfne = omnem uoluntatem (*sic* for *uolentem?*) *sequi* se docet abnegare se ipsum. [The error arose as in the preceding example.]

Mk. I. 2.2: forðon alexandriniscæ biscob wæs ðæs *uel* his ðerh ana *uel* syndrigo woerc wiste *uel to uutanne* godspelles in him gecuoedna tosceada & ðone ðeodscip in him æs ðætte oncneawa *uel* were oncnauen ðæt godeund = nam alexandriæ episcopus fuit cuius per singula opus *scire* euangelii in se dicta disponere et disciplinam in se legis agnosceret. [Or is the infinitive here, in Northumbrian and in Latin, a predicate nominative?]

I close this chapter with Synoptic Tables showing the Uses of the Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* and Some Substitutes for the Infinitive therein.

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE USES OF THE INFINITIVE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS"

The Active Infinitive with Active Verbs

Use:		Totals U.	Totals I.	Matthew U.	Matthew I.	Mark U.	Mark I.	Luke U.	Luke I.	John U.	John I.
Subjective:	Total.	29	23	12	8	11	4	6	11	..	..
	Gosp.	26	18	10	4	11	4	5	10	..	..
	Int.	3	5	2	4	..	..	1	1	..	..
Objective:	Total.	157	37	45	2	45	3	54	21	13	11
	Gosp.	129	32	29	2	41	2	48	19	11	9
	Int.	28	5	16	..	4	1	6	2	2	2
Other Substantival Uses:											
(1) As a Pred.-Nom.—											
	Total.	1	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	1	..
	Gosp.	1	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	..
	Int.	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
(2) As an Appositive—											
	Total.	5	1	2	..	1	1	2	..	..	..
	Gosp.	5	1	2	..	1	1	2	..	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
(3) As the Obj. of a Prep.—											
	Total.	1	4	..	1	..	..	1	3	..	..
	Gosp.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	1	4	..	1	..	..	1	3	..	..
Predicative with Aux. Verb:	Total.	Not counted	7	..	5	..	..	..	2	..	..
	Gosp.	..	6	..	4	..	..	..	2	..	..
	Int.	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predic. with *Wutun:*	Total.	7	..	2	..	3	..	1	..	1	..
	Gosp.	7	..	2	..	3	..	1	..	1	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predicative with *Bia(n)* (*Wosa*):											
(1) Of Necessity—	Total.	..	21	..	9	..	2	..	4	..	6
	Gosp.	..	4	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	3
	Int.	..	17	..	9	..	2	..	3	..	3
(2) Of Purpose—	Total.	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..
	Gosp.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
	Int.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
Predicative with Acc. Subj.:											
(1) As Object—	Total.	65	41	24	17	10	6	22	14	9	4
	Gosp.	38	4	14	2	6	2	14	..	4	..
	Int.	27	37	10	15	4	4	8	14	5	4
(2) As Subject—	Total.	31	1	14	..	5	..	9	1	3	..
	Gosp.	28	..	12	..	5	..	9	..	2	..
	Int.	3	1	2	..	..	..	..	1	1	..
Final:	Total.	54	82	20	30	8	16	15	29	11	7
	Gosp.	46	77	20	29	6	14	13	28	9	6
	Int.	8	5	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	1
Infin. with Adject.:	Total.	7	8	3	1	2	1	2	6	..	..
	Gosp.	7	8	3	1	2	1	2	6	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Other Adverbial Uses:											
(1) Of Cause—	Total.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
	Gosp.	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
(2) Of Result—	Total.	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..
	Gosp.	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
(3) Of Means—	Total.	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Gosp.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
Infin. with Nouns:	Total.	7	17	..	3	..	2	3	6	4	6
	Gosp.	6	10	..	1	..	2	2	3	4	4
	Int.	1	7	..	2	..	..	1	3	..	2
Imperative:	Total.	7	..	..	..	2	0	4	..	1	..
	Gosp.	6	..	..	..	2	0	3	..	1	..
	Int.	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	..

SYNOPTIC TABLE OF THE USES OF THE INFINITIVE IN THE "LINDISFARNE GOSPELS" (*Continued*)

The Active Infinitive with Passive Verbs

Use:		Totals U.	Totals I.	Matthew U.	Matthew I.	Mark U.	Mark I.	Luke U.	Luke I.	John U.	John I.
Subjective:	Total.	12	10	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	1
	Gosp.	12	10	2	3	4	3	4	3	2	1
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Objective:	Total.	4	2	2	1	1	..	1	..	..	1
	Gosp.	..	1	..	1	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	4	1	2	..	1	..	1	..	..	1
Predicative with Acc. Subj.:											
(1) As Object—	Total.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Gosp.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
(2) As Subject—	Total.	5	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	5	..
	Gosp.	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	1	2	..
	Int.	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	..
Final:	Total.	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
	Gosp.	..	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

The Passive Infinitive with Active Verbs

Predicative with Aux. Verbs:	Total.	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Gosp.	2	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

The Passive Infinitive with Passive Verbs

No example has been found.

SOME SUBSTITUTES FOR THE INFINITIVE

Predicate Nominative of Present Ptc.:	Total.	..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Gosp.	..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Int.	..		..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Predicate Accusative of Present Ptc.	Total.	96		27		26		19		34	
	Gosp.	94		25		26		19		24	
	Int.	2		2		..		..		..	
Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction:											
(a) Acc. and Pres. Ptc.	Total.	20		5		3		11		1	
	Gosp.	..		..		..		..		..	
	Int.	20		5		3		11		1	
(b) Acc. and Pret. Ptc.	Total.	9		2		3		3		1	
	Gosp.	1		..		..		..		1	
	Int.	8		2		3		3		..	

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

I briefly sum up what seem to me to be the Results of this investigation, first, concerning the Participle and, secondly, concerning the Infinitive:—

I. THE PARTICIPLE

A. The Absolute Participle

1. The normal Case of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is the dative-instrumental. Occasionally (about 21 times) the accusative is so used; and rarely (about 10 times), the nominative. With each of these absolute cases, the participle is at times not inflected; and each case has variant forms. In West Saxon, only the dative-instrumental case is used absolutely.

2. The Uses of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* correspond closely to those of the dative-instrumental absolute in West-Saxon and of the ablative absolute in Latin. The Absolute Participle denotes chiefly Time, occasionally Co-ordination, and less frequently still Manner, Means, Cause, and Concession.

3. Although we cannot draw positive conclusions from a single text, in all probability the ultimate Origin of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* whether in the dative-instrumental, the accusative, or the nominative, is to be found in the Latin original. In all instances except two (with the dative-instrumental), the Northumbrian absolute participle translates a Latin ablative absolute; and in the two exceptional instances, it translates a Latin appositive participle. But, while the absolute construction with the accusative and with the nominative is (as with the dative-instrumental) due ultimately to the influence of the Latin absolute construction of the original,

the particular case used, the accusative or the nominative, seems to depend upon tendencies within the Northumbrian dialect itself. The absolute use of the accusative seems to spring immediately from the Northumbrian interchange (or confusion) of dative and accusative, of which several other instances are cited in our study. The nominative absolute, on the other hand, appears to arise from the confusion of two constructions, that of the nominative subject to a finite verb and that of an oblique subject to an absolute participle. In several of the passages having the absolute nominative, the glossator gives two alternative renderings, (1) the finite verb and (2) the participle, the former calling for a nominative and the latter for an oblique case; but, in all except three of the ten examples of the absolute nominative, the glossator gives us the nominative only; and, in the three exceptional examples, the nominative interchanges with the accusative. But, while the Latin influence in the development of the absolute construction in Northumbrian and in West-Saxon was primary, there was at work a secondary influence of native origin, which is manifested in the expressions made up of a preposition (in Northumbrian usually *mið*, in West-Saxon *be*) plus a substantive and a participle in the dative-instrumental, possibly, also, of a substantive in the dative of the person interested plus a participle in the dative: see p. 44 above.

4. The ungenuineness of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is further evidenced by this: despite the fact that he is making an interlinear translation, the Northumbrian glossator in the majority of instances renders the Latin ablative absolute otherwise than by the absolute construction, usually by a co-ordinated finite verb or, somewhat less frequently, by a subordinated finite verb.

5. Except as to the Accusative Absolute and the Nominative Absolute, idioms unknown in West-Saxon, the results of our study of the Absolute Participle in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* correspond very closely with those derived from a study of this idiom in West-Saxon. The Dative-Instrumental Absolute, not

only in West-Saxon but in the Germanic languages as a whole, was an importation from the classical languages; and in the large majority of instances the Latin ablative absolute was rendered by a finite verb. As indicated in the preceeding paragraphs, the situation with reference to the dative-instrumental absolute is substantially the same in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* But the absolute use of the accusative and of the nominative, and the more frequent sloughing off of participial inflections, are due specifically to Northumbrian influences, as already indicated above.

B. The Appositive Participle

1. In the *Lindisfarne Gospels* the Appositive Participle occurs oftenest in the nominative Case, occasionally in the accusative and the dative, rarely in the genitive. The situation is substantially the same in West-Saxon.

2. In each of these cases, the appositive participle is often not Inflected; and each case has variant forms. Although usually following the strong declension, at times the appositive participle has the weak declension. Even when all allowances have been made, at times concord is lacking between participle and principal, much oftener than in West-Saxon.

3. The Uses of the Appositive Participle, as in West-Saxon, are threefold:—

(1) Adjectival, in which the participle is equivalent to a dependent adjectival (relative) clause.

(2) Adverbial, in which the participle is equivalent to a dependent adverbial (conjunctive) clause; subdivided into (*a*) modal (manner and means), (*b*) temporal, (*c*) causal, (*d*) final, (*e*) concessive, and (*f*) conditional clauses.

(3) Co-ordinate, in which the participle is substantially equivalent to an independent clause; subdivided into (*a*) the "circumstantial" participle in the narrower sense, which merely denotes an accompanying circumstance; and (*b*) the "iterating" participle, which simply repeats the idea of the chief verb.

4. As to the Origin of the Appositive Participle in the *Lin-*

disfarne Gospels, as in West-Saxon, in some uses it seems to be (A) native and in others (B) foreign (Latin).

A. *Native*

(1) In the following uses the appositive participle appears to be a native English idiom:—

(*a*) The Adjectival Use of the preterite participle and, possibly, of a few slightly verbal present participles like *living, lying* (*licgende*), etc.

(*b*) The Modal Use of the present and of the preterite participle when each denotes manner.

(*c*) Perhaps the Temporal Use of a few present participles of slight verbal force like *living* and *sleeping.*

B. *Foreign*

(2) In all other uses, on the other hand, especially when governing an accusative object, the appositive participle appears to be borrowed from the Latin. It is possible, however, that the Causal Use of the preterite participle may in part be an extension of the adjectival preterite participle; and that the Final Use of the appositive participle may in part be due to the use of the present participle after verbs of motion.

(3) The statements of (1) and of (2) above are substantiated, I believe, by the following considerations: (*a*) The uses specified in (1) occur not only in translating Latin appositive participles, but occasionally also when the original has no participle. (*b*) The uses of (1) are native in the West-Saxon dialect and, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole. (*c*) The uses specified in (2), with the rarest exceptions, occur only in translating Latin appositive participles; and in these uses the Latin appositive participle is far oftener translated by a finite verb, usually co-ordinate but occasionally subordinate. (*d*) The uses of (2) are due to foreign (Latin) influence in the West-Saxon dialect and, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole.

(4) From the statements made in (1)-(3) above as to the different origin of the several uses of the appositive participle, it follows that the Northumbrian dialect, like the West-Saxon, was favorable to the appositive participle with pronounced adjectival (descriptive) force, but was unfavorable to the appositive participle with strong verbal (assertive) force, though not so unfavorable as was the West-Saxon.

5. As in West-Saxon and in the Germanic languages as a whole, so in Northumbrian, originally the present appositive participle did not have the Power of Governing a Direct Object in construction. Except in eight examples out of a total of 299, the present participle with a direct object translates a Latin appositive participle with an object. And in the large majority of instances, the Latin present appositive participle with an object is translated by a finite verb in the Northumbrian gloss.

6. Nor did the preterite appositive participle have the power of governing a direct object in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* Only three examples occur therein; each translates a Latin appositive participle with an object (one being a deponent participle in the Latin); and of the three, one is in all probability due to a scribal error, as is indicated in the statistics.

7. In brief, the situation with reference to the Appositive Participle as a whole is quite similar in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* to what it is in the West-Saxon translations from the Latin and in the translations from the Greek and the Latin in the other Germanic languages. But, as was to be expected, the influence of the Latin is more powerful in the Northumbrian gloss than in the West-Saxon translations proper.

II. THE INFINITIVE

A. The Active Infinitive

1. In respect of the Form, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* has two active infinitives: (1) the uninflected, ending in *-a* or in *-e,* with phonetic variants, which in origin is the petrified and weathered nominative-accusative case of a neuter noun of action,

and corresponds to the West-Saxon uninflected infinitive ending, *-an;* and (2) the inflected, made up of the preposition *to* plus the dative case of the uninflected infinitive, ending in *-anne* (*-enne*), with phonetic variants. Occasionally, however, we have a compromise between these two, as in *to singa* (*to singe*) or in *singenne* without *to,* both of which forms are counted as inflected in this investigation. Once (in *Mat.* 26.17^{b}) we have the infinitive in *-anne* preceded by *til* instead of *to.*

2. As to the Voice of these two infinitives, it seems to me that the uninflected infinitive is habitually active in sense as in form in each of its various uses; but in several uses (subjective, objective, and predicative (with auxiliary verbs and with accusative subject)) sporadic examples occur of this infinitive that, though active in form, translates a Latin passive infinitive, and seems itself to be passive in sense. In far the majority of instances, however, the uninflected infinitive that translates a Latin passive infinitive is itself active in sense. The inflected infinitive, also, is usually active in sense except in the predicative use with *bia(n)* (*wosa*) to denote necessity (and once to denote purpose), in which it is invariably passive in sense, and in the predicative use with accusative subject, in object clauses, in which it more frequently translates a Latin passive gerundive, and is passive in sense, though occasionally it is active in sense. Very rarely, too, the inflected infinitive is passive in sense in the final use, owing to the nature of the Latin original. The infinitive that is active in form, then, whether uninflected or inflected, is somewhat oftener passive in sense in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* than in the West-Saxon translations,—a fact arising probably from the frequency of passive gerundives and passive infinitives in the Latin original and from the dislike of the glossator for the compound passive infinitive.

3. In keeping with its origin, the infinitive is of dual Nature, partaking, at one and the same time, of the nature both of the noun and of the verb. But, despite this fact, one of these two tendencies, the substantival and the verbal, usually predomi-

nates; and from this standpoint we may roughly divide all infinitives into two comprehensive classes, (1) substantival and (2) verbal (or predicative). More generally useful, however, is the classification according to the dominant Function of the infinitive; according to which an infinitive is substantival, predicative, adverbial, or adjectival.

4. The Uses of the Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* are fourfold:—

(1) Substantival, subdivided into:

(*a*) Subjective, oftenest with the infinitive uninflected, but often inflected.

(*b*) Objective, oftenest with the infinitive uninflected, but often inflected.

(*c*) Other Substantival Uses:

(*aa*) As a Predicate Nominative, very rare, with the infinitive uninflected in the one example and inflected in the other.

(*bb*) As an Appositive, infrequent, oftener with the infinitive uninflected.

(*cc*) As the Object of a Preposition, infrequent, oftener with the infinitive inflected.

(2) Predicative (or more Verbal), in which we have the infinitive:

(*a*) As the Predicative Complement after:

(*aa*) Auxiliary Verbs, with the infinitive normally uninflected, but sporadically inflected.

(*bb*) The Adhortative *Wutun,* infrequent, with the infinitive invariably uninflected.

(*cc*) *Bia(n)* (*Wosa*) to denote habitually Necessity, but occasionally Purpose, with the infinitive inflected in each use. In West-Saxon, this infinitive occasionally denotes, also, Futurity.

(*b*) As the Quasi-Predicate of:

(*aa*) An Accusative Subject after certain groups of verbs ((1) of Commanding, (2) of Causing and Permitting, (3) of Sense Perception, (4) of Mental Perception, (5) of Declaring, and (6) of Other Verbs), with the infinitive oftenest uninflect-

ed, but not infrequently inflected. The accusative-with-infinitive construction is much more frequent in objective than in subjective clauses. The situation is much the same in West-Saxon except that the inflected infinitive as predicate (whether in objective or in subjective clauses) is rare, as is the uninflected infinitive with accusative subject in subjective clauses.

(*bb*) A Dative Subject apparently, but not really, with the infinitive sometimes uninflected and sometimes inflected.

(*c*) As the Predicate in Imperative Clauses, infrequent, with the infinitive invariably uninflected. In West-Saxon, this idiom is not found.

(3) Adverbial, subdivided into:

(*a*) Final, frequent, with the infinitive both uninflected and inflected.

(*b*) Causal, very rare, with the infinitive inflected only.

(*c*) Specificatory, with Adjectives, not infrequent, with the infinitive somewhat more frequently inflected than not.

(*d*) Consecutive, with verbs, very rare, with the infinitive inflected only.

(*e*) Instrumental, with verbs, very rare, with the infinitive inflected only.

(4) Adjectival, to limit a Noun or Pronoun, in which use we have habitually the inflected infinitive, but occasionally the uninflected infinitive. In one example the inflected infinitive closely approximates a Latin gerundive.

5. The Differentiation between the Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive seems to rest upon this general principle, though not without a few apparent, if not real, exceptions: the uninflected infinitive is used normally, in substantival uses, as a nominative or an accusative of a verbal noun; in predicative and in adverbial uses, as an accusative; the inflected infinitive is used normally, in substantival (as object of verb or of preposition), in predicative, in adverbial, and in adjectival uses, to represent a case other than the nominative or the accusative, what for lack of a better term I should designate an "indirect case," which corresponds oftenest, as

would be expected from its composition, to the dative case, but also to the genitive case and to the instrumental case. And, owing to the influence of dativel verbs and verbal phrases, we frequently have the inflected infinitive used as the subject of a finite verb. In accordance with this general principle, we find that:—

(1) Normally the Uninflected Infinitive is used to denote:

(*a*) The Subject of most finite verbs.

(*b*) The direct Object of most verbs governing an accusative of the direct object.

(*c*) The Appositive to a noun or pronoun.

(*d*) Purpose after a few verbs of motion and of commanding and requesting.

(*e*) The Predicative Complement of (*aa*) the Auxiliary Verbs (except *aga,* with which only the inflected infinitive is found) and (*bb*) the Verb of Motion, *Wutun,* as in *Wutun geonga.*

(*f*) The Quasi-Predicate of (*aa*) an Accusative Subject.

(2) Normally the Inflected Infinitive is used to denote:

(*a*) The Subject of dativel verbs and verbal phrases, especially when in proximity thereto.

(*b*) The "indirect case" Object of verbs governing a noun object in the genitive, or the dative, or the instrumental.

(*c*) The Predicative Complement after *Bia*(*n*) (*Wosa*) to denote Necessity or Obligation.

(*d*) The "indirect case" adverbial modifier of Verbs, to express Purpose.

(*e*) The "indirect case" phrasal, adjectival modifier of Nouns or Pronouns, in which construction the infinitive usually represents a genitive or a dative case.

(3) The Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive are each used to denote:

(*a*) The Object with a number of verbs of double regimen.

(*b*) The adverbial (final) modifier of certain Verbs (1) of Motion and (2) of Giving.

(*c*) The adverbial (specificatory) modifier of Adjectives.

(4) Datival verbs or verbal phrases at times Attract what would normally be an uninflected infinitive into an inflected infinitive, especially if in proximity to the infinitive.

(5) The presence of Gerund or of Gerundive in the Latin original (whether with or without a preposition) tends to the use of the inflected infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels;* as does, also, the presence of the Latin Future Participle.

(6) Analogy at times upsets original conditions.

(7) Naturally, in a late text, like the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* the distinction between the two infinitives is less strictly observed than in Early West-Saxon; and, in keeping with the analytic trend of the English language, the inflected infinitive gains upon the uninflected infinitive, though not to so great a degree as in Late West-Saxon.

(8) Sporadically the Uninflected Infinitive is used to denote:

(*a*) The Subject of verbs that normally have the inflected infinitive.

(*b*) The Object of verbs that normally have the inflected infinitive.

(*c*) The Predicate Nominative.

(*d*) The Object of a Preposition (more commonly inflected).

(*e*) The Quasi-Predicate to a Dative Subject, apparently but not really.

(*f*) The Predicate in Imperative Clauses.

(*g*) Purpose where we should expect the inflected infinitive, especially in the later members of a series of co-ordinated (inflected) infinitives.

(*h*) The Adjectival Complement of a Noun or Pronoun.

(9) Sporadically the Inflected Infinitive is used to denote:

(*a*) The Subject of verbs that normally have the uninflected infinitive.

(*b*) The Object of verbs that normally have the uninflected infinitive.

(*c*) The Predicate Nominative.

(*d*) The Appositive to a Noun or Pronoun, when in proximity to some word usually followed by the inflected infinitive.

(*e*) The Object of a Preposition.

(*f*) The Predicative Complement of (*aa*) a few Auxiliary Verbs and of (*bb*) *Bia(n)* (*Wosa*) to denote Purpose.

(*g*) The Quasi-Predicate of (*aa*) an Accusative Subject;[1] and of (*bb*) a Dative Subject, apparently but not really.

(*h*) Purpose where we should expect an uninflected infinitive, as in a series of co-ordinated (uninflected) infinitives.

(*i*) Cause with verbs.

(*j*) Result with verbs.

(*k*) Means with verbs.

6. The Position of the Lindisfarne Infinitive is almost always identical with that of its Latin original, and hence has not been discussed in this study.

7. As to the Origin of the constructions with the active infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* we may draw tentative conclusions, the more so that the uses in the Lindisfarne text usually coincide with those in the Rushworth text of the Gospels. Accordingly, in some uses the infinitive appears to be (A) native and in others (B) foreign (Latin).

A. NATIVE

(1) In the following uses the infinitive appears to be a native English idiom:—

I. Substantival

(*a*) Subjective, uniflected and inflected, with active verbs.

(*b*) Objective, with the following active verbs:—[2]

[1] One hesitates to put this use of the inflected infinitive as quasi-predicate to an accusative subject under sporadic, or occasional, uses, for over forty examples thereof have been found. But normally the infinitive with subject accusative is uninflected (about 97 examples).

[2] Owing to the paucity of examples of the infinitive as the object with the other verbs listed in the chapter on "the Objective Infinitive" and not given in (*aa*) and (*bb*), the origin of the infinitive with those verbs is indeterminable.

(*aa*) Followed by the Uninflected Infinitive Only: Verbs of Commanding (*gehata, hata*).

(*bb*) Followed by the Uninflected Infinitive and the Inflected Infinitive: Verbs of Commanding (*bebeada*); of Beginning (*onginna*); and of Inclination and Will (*soeca* and *wil(l)niga*).

(*c*) Predicate Nominative, in part, half the time uninflected and half the time inflected.

(*d*) Appositive, in part, normally uninflected.

II. Predicative (or More Verbal)

(*a*) With Auxiliary Verbs, uninflected save in a few sporadic cases.

(*b*) With *Wutun,* in the main, uninflected.

(*c*) With Accusative Subject, as object, uninflected, after (*aa*) verbs of Commanding: *gehata, hata;* (*bb*) verbs of Causing and Permitting: *doa, gedoa, gewyrca* (?), *wyrca* (?); *forgeafa, forleta, gelefa, lefa, leta, ðerhgelefa;* (*cc*) verbs of Sense Perception: *gesea, sea;* (*dd*) verbs of Mental Perception: *getrymma;* and (*ee*) verbs of Inclination and of Will: *willa.*—Owing to the paucity of examples of the accusative-with-infinitive construction after a number of verbs listed in the chapter on "the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject" but not given here or under "B. Foreign" below, the origin of the idiom with those verbs is indeterminable.

(*d*) With Accusative Subject, as object, inflected, after a verb of double regimen (*lefa*).

(*e*) With apparent but not real Dative Subject, uninflected and inflected.

III. Adverbial

(*a*) With Verbs:

(*aa*) Final, uninflected, after verbs of Motion.

(*bb*) Causal, inflected, in part.

(*cc*) Consecutive, inflected, in the main.

(*b*) With Adjectives:

(*aa*) Specificatory, slightly more frequently inflected than uninflected.

IV. Adjectival

(*a*) With Noun or Pronoun, habitually inflected, except, possibly, when the infinitive is equivalent to a genitive phrase, or when the infinitive is used strictly as a Latin gerundive (see Section XIII, Note 3, of Chapter III).

B. FOREIGN (LATIN)

(2) In the following uses, on the other hand, the infinitive appears to be borrowed from the Latin:—

I. Substantival

(*a*) Subjective, uninflected and inflected, with passive verbs.

(*b*) Objective, uninflected and inflected, with passive[3] verbs.

(*c*) Predicate Nominative, in part, half the time uninflected and half the time inflected.

(*d*) Appositive, in part, normally uninflected.

(*e*) As the Object of a Preposition, usually inflected.

II. Predicative (or More Verbal)

(*a*) With *Wutun,* in part, uninflected only.

(*b*) With Accusative Subject, as object, uninflected, after (*aa*) verbs of Declaring (*cuoeða, onsacca*).—Owing to the paucity of examples of the accusative-with-infinitive construction after a number of verbs listed in the chapter on "the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject" but not given here or under "A. Native" above, the origin of the idiom with those verbs is indeterminable.

[3] Owing to the paucity of examples of the objective infinitive with active verbs, we cannot determine with which, if any, active verbs the objective infinitive is of Latin origin.

(*c*) With Accusative Subject, as object, inflected, in all save a few examples after a verb of double regimen, the inflected infinitive translating a Latin future participle or, usually, a Latin gerundive.

(*d*) With Accusative Subject, as subject, uninflected except sporadically, with both active and passive verbs. [In the two instances of the inflected infinitive, the inflection is due to the proximity of the infinitive to a dative-governing adjective or verb: see Section VIII of Chapter III.]

(*e*) With *Bia*(*n*) (*Wosa*), inflected only, to denote (*aa*) Necessity or Obligation and (*bb*) Purpose (the latter whether passive or active in sense).

(*f*) In Imperative Clauses, uninflected only.

III. Adverbial

(a) With Verbs:

(*aa*) Final, inflected, after verbs of whatever kind, both active and passive.

(*bb*) Final, uninflected, after verbs (1) of Commanding and Requesting and (2) of Giving.

(*cc*) Causal, inflected, in part.

(*dd*) Consecutive, inflected, in part.

(*ee*) Instrumental(?).

IV. Adjectival

(*a*) With Noun or Pronoun, habitually inflected, when the infinitive is equivalent to a genitive phrase, and when the infinitive is strictly equivalent to a Latin gerundive (see Section XIII, Note 3, of Chapter III).

(3) The statements of (1) and of (2) above as to which uses of the infinitive are native and which are foreign, are substantiated, I believe, by the following considerations: (*a*) The uses specified in (1) occur, as a rule, not only in translating Latin infinitives, but also when the Latin has no infinitive; and, when the Latin has the infinitive, it is not often avoided.

(*b*) The uses of (1) are, as a rule, native in the West-Saxon dialect and, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole. (*c*) The uses specified in (2), with the rarest exceptions, occur only in translating certain Latin idioms (chiefly an infinitive, a gerund or gerundive, and a future participle); and often, as in the case of the infinitive-with-accusative construction after verbs of Declaring, the Latin idiom is avoided instead of being imitated. (*d*) The uses of (2) are, as a rule, due to foreign (Latin) influence in the West-Saxon dialect and, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole.

8. The situation, therefore, with reference to the Active Infinitive in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* is quite similar to that in West-Saxon, especially in the late *West-Saxon Gospels*. But, again, the influence of the Latin is more powerful in the gloss than in the translation. Moreover, the *Lindisfarne Gospels* has some peculiarities of its own. The following idioms, not recorded in West-Saxon, are occasionally found in the Lindisfarne gloss: the Infinitive as the Object of a Preposition; the Imperative Use of the Infinitive; and the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction (see under C below: "Substitutes for the Infinitive"). The following idioms, though known in West-Saxon, are much more common in the *Lindisfarne Gospels*: the Inflected Infinitive as the Predicate of an Accusative Subject in Objective Clauses; the Uninflected Infinitive as the Predicate of an Accusative Subject in Subjective Clauses; and, in several functions, indicated in Chapter III, the occasional use of an Uninflected Infinitive in a Passive Sense, though active in form. Most of these peculiar uses, however, as has been shown in the body of my study, have arisen merely from the fact that, in the Lindisfarne gloss, the Latin original has been much more closely followed than in the West-Saxon translations.

B. The Passive Infinitive

9. Far more rarely than in West-Saxon the *Lindisfarne Gospels* makes use of a compound Passive Infinitive, which is made up of the present active infinitive, *wosa,* plus the past

participle. Neither part of this compound infinitive is inflected.

10. This infinitive is passive in sense as well as in form.

11. This passive infinitive is found only twice in the whole of the *Lindisfarne Gospels,* then as the Predicative Complement of an Auxiliary Verb.

12. The passive infinitive is due to Latin influence. (*a*) In each of the only two examples in the Lindisfarne gloss, the Latin original has a passive infinitive. (*b*) The passive infinitive of the Latin original in numerous instances and in various uses is avoided by a periphrasis. (*c*) The passive infinitive is due to Latin influence in the West-Saxon dialect and, probably, in the Germanic languages as a whole.

C. Substitutes for the Infinitive

13. The *Lindisfarne Gospels* at times makes use of some Substitutes for the Infinitive.

(1) Of the Predicate Nominative of the Present Participle for the Predicative Infinitive after Verbs of Motion, as in the West-Saxon *He com fleogende* from *He com fleogan,* no clear example has been found in the *Lindisfarne Gospels.* In West-Saxon, however, the idiom is quite common.

(2) On the other hand, of the Predicate Accusative of the Present Participle for the Predicative Infinitive with Accusative Subject, chiefly after verbs of Sense Perception and of Mental Perception, as in *Mk.* 14.58[a]: ue *geherdon hine . . . cuoeðende* = *audiuimus eum dicentem,* examples are numerous in the *Lindisfarne Gospels* as in the *West-Saxon Gospels.* In the former work, the idiom is due to Latin influence: (*a*) the Lindisfarne participle almost invariably translates a Latin participle; and (*b*) the idiom is due to Latin influence in the West-Saxon dialect and in the Germanic languages as a whole.

(3) In the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, which occurs chiefly after verbs of Commanding and of Declaring, we have usually (A) an Accusative plus a Present Participle translating a Latin elliptical accusative-with-infini-

tive construction consisting either (*a*) of an accusative plus a future participle without *esse* or, more frequently, (*b*) of an accusative plus a gerundive without *esse,* as in *Mat.* I. 20.4: *geðrouende hine foresægde = Passurum se prænuntians;* and *Mk.* I. 4.14[a]: *forecueð hine slaende = praedicens se occidendum.* Occasionally we have (B) an Accusative plus a Preterite Participle translating a Latin elliptical accusative-with-infinitive construction consisting usually (*a*) of an accusative plus a gerundive without *esse* or occasionally (*b*) of an accusative plus a past participle, as in *Mat.* I. 16.14[c]: *gelaeres soðfeastnisse ofersuiðed = docet iustitiam superandam;* and *Mk.* I. 1.6[b], 7: in stefne engles *sægende gesended* ne ðæt ane *word* lichoma geworden ah lichoma drihtes ðerh word godcundes stefn *gesaweled* = in uoce angeli *enuntiantis emissum* non solum *uerbum* caro factum sed corpus domini per uerbum diuinæ uocis *animatum.* Type A of this idiom is certainly, and type B is probably, due to Latin influence. Of neither type have I found a clear example in West-Saxon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Text Used

Skeat, W. W.: *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon, Northumbrian, and Old Mercian Versions, Synoptically Arranged, with Collations Exhibiting All the Readings of All the MSS.; together with the Early Latin Version as Contained in the Lindisfarne MS., Collated with the Latin Version in the Rushworth MS.*, Cambridge, England, 1871-1887.

II. Works Consulted

Ackermann, A. H.: *Die Sprache der Ältesten Schottischen Urkunden* [A. D. 1385-1440], Göttingen Dis., Berlin, 1897(?).

Akerlund, A.: "A Word on the Passive Definite Tenses," in *Englische Studien*, XLVII, 1914, pp. 321-337.

Armstrong, E. C.: *Syntax of the French Verb*, 2nd ed., New York, 1915.

Aron, A. W.: *Die Progressiven Formen im Mittelhochdeutschen und Frühneuhochdeutschen*, University of Wisconsin Dis., Frankfurt a. M., 1914. [Although written at the University of Wisconsin and published in Germany, this dissertation has on its title-page this secondary heading: *New York University Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs*, No. X.]

Aronius, J.: *Diplomatische Studien über die Älteren Angelsächsischen Urkunden* [to 839], Königsberg Dis., 1883.

Ayres, H. M.: *Bibliographical Sketch of Anglo-Saxon Literature*, New York, 1910.

Baccke, J. H.: *A Few Steps to a Complete Dictionary of English Dialects*, Hamburg, 1890.

Bale, C. E.: *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in the Lindisfarne Gospels* (= *Iowa Studies in Language and Literature*, No. 1), Iowa University Master's Thesis, The State University of Iowa, 1907 (= *Bulletin of the State University of Iowa*, New Series, No. 154, May, 1907).

Barnes, W.: "A Grammar and Glossary of the Dorset Dialect," in *Transactions of the Philological Society* [London] for 1864, pp. 1-103.

Baumann, Ida: *Die Sprache der Urkunden aus Yorkshire im 15. Jahrhundert* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XI), Heidelberg, 1902.

Bech, F.: "Beispiele von der Abschleifung des Deutschen Participium Präsentis und von Seinem Ersatz durch den Infinitiv," in *Zeit-*

schrift für Deutsche Wortforschung, I, 1901, pp. 81-109. [This essay is a reworking of Bech's earlier article with the same title, which was published in the Zeitz Program of 1882.]

BECHER, R.: *Wulfstans Homilien*, Leipzig Dis., 1910.

BEER,[1] A.: *Kleine Beiträge zur Gotischen Syntax: I. Der Absolute Dativ* (a reprint from the *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* for 1904), Prag, 1904.

BEER,[2] A.: "Gab es Einen Gotischen Nominativus Absolutus?" in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXVII, 1911, pp. 169-171.

BEHAGHEL,[1] O.: *Die Syntax des Heliand*, Wien, 1897.

BEHAGHEL,[2] O.: *Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache* (reprint from Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*), 3rd ed., Strassburg, 1911.

BESUCH, A.: *Studien zur Wortstellung im Alt- und Mittelhochdeutschen*, Breslau Dis., 1903.

BIRCH, WALTER DE GRAY: *Cartularium Saxonicum, A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, 3 vols, with an Index of Names, London, 1885-1899.

BLATZ, F.: *Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., Karlsruhe, 1895-1896.

BLÜMEL,[1] R.: *Die Haupttypen der Heutigen Neuhochdeutschen Wortstellung im Hauptsatz* (= *Untersuchungen zur Indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft*, herausgegeben von Brugmann und Thumb, No. V), Strassburg, 1914.

BLÜMEL,[2] R.: *Einführung in die Syntax*, Heidelberg, 1914.

BOEKENOOGEN, G. J.: "Toelichting: *Werckende Dag*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XVII, 1898, pp. 234-235.

BOLL, P.: *Die Sprache der Altenglischen Glossen in MS. Harley 3376* (= *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft XV, pp. 1-100), Bonn, 1904.

BOLTE, J.: "Die Indische Redefigur Yatha-samkhya in Europäischer Dichtung," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXII, 1904, pp. 265-276.

BOND, E. A.: *Facsimiles of Ancient Charters in the British Museum* (*Anglo-Saxon Period*), four parts, London, 1873-1878.

BOUTERWEK,[1] K. W.: *Die Vier Evangelien in Alt-Nordhumbrischer Sprache*, Gütersloh, 1857.

BOUTERWEK,[2] K. W.: *Screadunga: Anglo-Saxonica Maximam Partem Inedita*, Elberfeld, 1858. [It contains, among other pieces, the "Introduction" to the Lindisfarne *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*; and the whole of the Rushworth *Mark*.]

BRANDL,[1] A.: "Englische Literatur," in Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 2nd ed., II, pp. 941-1134, Strassburg, 1908.

BRANDL,[2] A.: *Zur Geographie der Altenglischen Dialekte* (= *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1915, No. IV), Berlin, 1915.

BRENNER, E.: *Der Altenglische Junius-Psalter, Die Interlinear-Glosse der Handschrift Junius 27 der Bodleiana zu Oxford* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XXIII), Heidelberg, 1909.

BRIGHT,[1] J. W.: "The Objective Absolute in English," in *Modern Language Notes*, V, 1890, pp. 80-81.

BRIGHT,[2] J. W.: *The Gospel of Saint Luke in Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford, 1893.

BRIGHT,[3] J. W.: *The Gospel of Saint Matthew in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint Mark in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint Luke in West-Saxon, The Gospel of Saint John in West-Saxon*, Boston, 1904-1906.

BRILIOTH, B.: *The Dialect of Lurton* (*Cumberland*) (= *Publications of the Philological Society* [London], I), Oxford, 1913.

BROWN,[1] E. M.: *Die Sprache der Rushworth Glossen zum Evangelium Matthäus und der Mercische Dialekt*, I. *Vokale*, Göttingen Dis., 1891.

BROWN,[2] E. M.: *The Language of the Rushworth Gloss to the Gospel of Matthew and the Mercian Dialect, Part II. The Vowels of Other Syllables than Stem-syllables; Consonants; Inflection*, Göttingen, 1892.

BRÜNING, G.: *An Illustration of the Formation of the Future Tense in the English Language*, Lübeck Progr., 1871.

BRUGMANN, K.: *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1904.

BRUGMANN, K., and DELBRÜCK, B.: *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Zweite Bearbeitung, 2 Bd., Zweiter Teil, Strassburg, 1911.

BRYAN, W. F.: *Studies in the Dialects of the Kentish Charters of the Old English Period*, University of Chicago Dis., Menasha, Wisconsin, 1915.

BÜLBRING,[1] K. D.: "Was Lässt Sich aus dem Gebrauch der Buchstaben *K* und *C* im Matthäus-Evangelium des Rushworth-Manuscripts Folgern?" in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, IX, 1909, pp. 289-300.

BÜLBRING,[2] K. D.: "Zur Altnordhumbrischen Grammatik," in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, X, 1900, pp. 368-372.

BÜLBRING,[3] K. D.: *Altenglisches Elementarbuch, I. Teil: Lautlehre*, Heidelberg, 1902.

CALLAWAY,[1] M., Jr.: *The Absolute Participle in Anglo-Saxon*, Johns Hopkins Dis., Baltimore, 1889.

CALLAWAY,[2] M., Jr.: "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XVI, 1901, pp. 141-360.

CALLAWAY,[3] M., Jr.: *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, Washington, D. C., 1913.

CARPENTER, H. C. A.: *Die Deklination in der Nordhumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung der Lindisfarner Handschrift* (= *Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft II), Bonn, 1910.

CARR, W.: *The Dialect of Craven, in the West Riding of the County of York*, 2nd ed., 2 vols., London, 1828.

CHADWICK, H. M.: "Studies in Old English," in *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, IV, 1899, pp. 85-265, London, 1899.

CHASE, F. H.: "The Absolute Participle in the Old English Appollonius," in *Modern Language Notes*, VIII, 1893, pp. 243-245.

COLVILLE, J.: *Studies in Lowland Scots*, Edinburgh and London, 1909.

COOK,[1] A. S.: *A Glossary of the Old Northumbrian Gospels* (*Lindisfarne Gospels or Durham Book*), Halle, 1894.

COOK,[2] A. S.: "Archaic English in the Twelfth Century," in the *Scottish Historical Review*, XII, 1915, pp. 213-215.

COWLING, G. H.: *The Dialect of Hackness* (North-East Yorkshire), Cambridge, 1915.

CRENSHAW, J. B.: *The Present Participle in Old High German and Middle High German*, Johns Hopkins Dis., Baltimore, dated 1893, but not issued until 1901.

CUNY, F.: *Der Temporale Wert der Passiven Umschreibungen im Althochdeutschen*, Bonn Dis., 1905.

CURME,[1] G. O.: "History of the English Gerund," in *Englische Studien*, XLV, 1912, pp. 349-380.

CURME,[2] G. O.: "Development of the Progressive Form in Germanic," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, XXVIII, 1913, pp. 159-187.

CURME,[3] G. O.: "Has English a Future Tense?" in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XII, 1913, pp. 515-539.

CURME,[4] G. O.: "The Proper Subject of a Passive Verb in English," in *Modern Language Notes*, XXVIII, 1913, pp. 97-101.

CURME,[5] G. O.: "The Gerund in Old English and German," in *Anglia*, XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 491-498.

CURME,[6] G. O.: "Origin and Force of the Split Infiniitve," in *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 1914, pp. 41-45.

CURME,[7] G. O.: "The Old English Gerund Again," in *Englische Studien*, XLIX, 1916, p. 323.

DANKER, O.: *Laut- und Flexionslehre der Mittel-Kentischen Denkmäler*, Strassburg Dis., 1879.

DELBRÜCK,[1] B.: *Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, 3 vols., Strassburg, 1893-1900.

DELBRÜCK,[2] B.: "Das Gotische 'Du' und das Westgermanische Gerundium," in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XXI, 1907, pp. 355-357.

DELBRÜCK,[3] B.: *Synkretismus: Ein Beitrag zur Germanischen Kasuslehre*, Strassburg, 1907.

DELBRÜCK,[4] B.: "Beiträge zur Germanischen Syntax: II. Zur Stellung des Verbums im Gotischen und Altisländischen; III. Ellipse des Infinitivs bei Hilfsverben," in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXVI, 1910, pp. 359-365.

DELCOURT, J.: *Essai sur la Langue de Sir Thomas More d'après Ses Oeuvres Anglaises*, Paris Dis., Montpelier, 1914.

DENECKE, A.: *Der Gebrauch des Infinitivs bei den Althochdeutschen Uebersetzern des 8. and 9. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig Dis., 1880.

DEUTSCHBEIN, M.: "Dialektisches in der Angelsächsischen Uebersetzung von Beda's Kirchengeschichte," in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXVI, 1901, pp. 169-244.

DIEHN, O.: *Die Pronomina im Frühmittelenglischen: Laut- und Flexionslehre* (= *Kieler Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft I), Heidelberg, 1901.

DIELS, P.: *Die Stellung des Verbums in der Älteren Althochdeutschen Prosa* (= *Palaestra*, No. LIX), Berlin, 1906.

DIENINGHOFF, J.: *Die Umschreibungen Aktiver Vergangenheit mit dem Participium Praeteriti im Althochdeutschen*, Bonn Dis., 1904.

DIETER, F.: *Ueber Sprache und Mundart der Ältesten Englischen Denkmäler der Epinaler und Cambridger Glossen, mit Berücksichtigung des Erfurter Glossars*, Göttingen, 1885.

DIETZ, C.: *Die Lateinische Vorlage des Althochdeutschen Tatian*, Leipzig Dis., 1893.

DITTES, R.: *Ueber den Gebrauch der Participien und des Gerundiums im Altprovenzalischen*, Budweis Progr., 1902.

DODD, L. H.: *A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies* (= *Yale Studies in English*, No. XXXV), New York, 1908.

DÖLLE, E.: *Zur Sprache Londons vor Chaucer* (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XXXII), Halle, 1913.

DUNKHASE, H.: *Die Sprache der Wulfstans'chen Homilien in Wulfgeats Handschriften*, Jena Dis., 1906.

DUSENSCHOEN, F.: *Die Präpositionen "Æfter," "Æt," und "Be" in der Altenglischen Poesie*, Kiel Dis., 1907.

EASTMAN, C. W.: *Die Syntax des Dativs bei Notker*, Leipzig Dis., 1898.

EBELING, P.: *Der Syntaktische Gebrauch der Participia in der Kudrun*, Halle a. S. Progr., 1912. [Since writing the footnote on p. 21 of my *Studies*, I have acquired a copy of Ebeling's essay.]

ECKERT, V.: *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Gerundivs im Deutschen*, Heidelberg Dis., 1909.

EICHHORN, E. A.: *Das Participium bei Gower im Vergleich mit Chaucers Gebrauch*, Kiel Dis., 1912.

EINENKEL,[1] E.: "Die Dänischen Elemente in der Syntax der Englischen Sprache," in *Anglia*, XXIX, 1906, pp. 120-128.

EINENKEL,[2] E.: "Zur Geschichte des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia*, XXXVII, 1913, pp. 382-392.

EINENKEL,[3] E.: "Die Entwickelung des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia*, XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 1-76.

EINENKEL,[4] E.: "Nachträge zum Gerundium," in *Anglia*, XXXVIII, 1914, p. 212.

EINENKEL,[5] E.: "Zur Herkunft des Englischen Gerundiums," in *Anglia*, XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 499-504.

EINENKEL,[6] E.: *Geschichte der Englischen Sprache: II. Historische Syntax* (reprint from Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*), 3rd ed., Strassburg, 1916.

EITLE, H.: *Die Satzverknüpfung bei Chaucer* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XLIV), Heidelberg, 1914.

EKWALL, E.: "Einige Skandinavische Flexionsformen im Mittelenglischen," in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XXI, 1910, pp. 47-54.

ELLINGER,[1] J.: "Die Forschung auf dem Gebiete der Neuenglischen Syntax in den Jahren 1898-1908," in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, I, 1909, pp. 437-445, 704.

ELLINGER,[2] J.: "Der Akkusativ oder Nominativ mit Infinitiv im Neuenglischen," in *Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien*, LXI, 1910, pp. 481-508.

ELLIS, A. J.: *The Existing Phonology of English Dialects Compared with That of West Saxon Speech*, in his *Early English Pronunciation*, Part V, pp. 1-835, London, 1889.

ENGEL, H.: "Der Infinitiv als Voranstehendes Subjekt," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXVI, 1906, pp. 382-383.

ERDMANN, O.: *Grundzüge der Deutschen Syntax*, I, Stuttgart, 1886; II, by Erdmann and Mensing, 1898.

FALK, H., and TORP, A.: *Dansk-Norskens Syntax i Historisk Fremstilling*, Kristiania, 1900.

FINK, F. W.: *Ueber den Dativ im Althochdeutschen Tatian*, Berlin Dis., 1898.

FISCHER, A.: *Der Syntaktische Gebrauch der Partikeln "Of" und "From" in Ælfrics Heiligenleben und in den Blickling-Homilien*, Leipzig Dis., 1908.

FLOM,[1] G. T.: *Scandinavian Influence on Southern Lowland Scotch* (= *Columbia University Germanic Studies*, Vol. I, No. 1), New York, 1900.

FLOM,[2] G. T.: "Norse Elements in English Dialects: A Survey of the Study," reprinted from the *Saga Book of the Viking Club*, Society for Northern Research, 1911.

FÖRSTER,[1] M.: A Review of Cook's *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers* (London, 1898), in *Englische Studien*, XXVII, 1900, pp. 419-430.

FÖRSTER,[2] M.: "Zur Älteren Kentischen Evangelien-Handschrift," in *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XIII, 1902, p. 181.

FÖRSTER,[3] M.: "Eine Neue Altenglische Psalterglosse," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXXII, 1909, pp. 96-98.

FOLEY, EMILY H.: *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of Saint Matthew, Part I. Phonology* (= *Yale Studies in English*, No. XIV), New York, 1903.

FRANCK, J.: "Mittelniederländische Miscellenen: III. Zum Participium Praesentis," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, II, 1882, pp. 33-38.

FRANZ, W.: "Neuere und Neueste Historische Grammatiken des Neuenglischen," in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, II, 1910, pp. 649-660.

FÜCHSEL, H.: "Die Sprache der Northumbrischen Interlinearversion zum Johannes-Evangelium," in *Anglia*, XXIV, 1901, pp. 1-99.

GAAF, W. VAN DER: "The Origin of *Would Rather* and Some of Its Analogies," in *Englische Studien*, XLV, 1912, pp. 381-396.

GABRIELSON, A.: *The Influence of W in Old English as Seen in the Middle English Dialects*, Leipzig, 1912.

GARNER, S.: "The Gerundial Construction in the Romanic Languages," in *Modern Language Notes*, II, 1881, pp. 55-59, 136-141.

GÖCKING, W.: *Das Partizipium bei Notker*, Strassburg Dis., 1905.

GÖRANSSON, C. E.: *Die Doppelpräpositionalen Infinitive im Deutschen*, Götersborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 1911.

GONSER, P.: *Das Angelsächsische Prosa-Leben des Heiligen Guthlac* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XXVII), Heidelberg, 1909.

GOTTWEISS, R.: *Syntax der Präpositionen "Æt," "Be," "Ymb" in der Ælfric-Homilien und Andern Homiliensammlungen unter Hinweis auf Romanischen Sprachgebrauch*, Leipzig Dis., Halle, 1905.

GREEN, A.: *The Dative of Agency: A Chapter of Indo-European Case-Syntax* (= *Columbia University Germanic Studies*), New York, 1913.

GRIMM, C.: *Glossar zum Vespasian-Psalter und den Hymnen* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XVIII), Heidelberg, 1906.

GRIMM, J.: *Deutsche Grammatik*, 4 vols., ed. by Röthe and Schröder, Gütersloh, 1897-1898.

GRUBER, K. W.: *Die Hauptquellen des Corpus-, Epinal-, und Erfurter Glossars*, München Dis., Erlangen, 1904.

GÜNTHER, F.: "Edmund Spensers Syntaktische Eigentümlichkeiten," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LV, 1876, pp. 17-82.

GUMMERE, F. B.: "On the English Dative-Nominative of the Personal Pronoun," in *The American Journal of Philology*, IV, 1883, pp. 283-290.

HAGEDORN, W.: *Ueber die Sprache Einiger Nördlicher Chaucerschüler*, Göttingen Dis., 1892.

HAILE, C. H.: *"Shall" and "Will" and the English Subjunctive*, Richmond, Indiana, 1913.

HALLBECK, E. S.: *The Language of the Middle-English Bestiary*, Lund Dis., 1905.

HARGREAVES, A.: *The Dialect of Adlington (Lancashire)* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XIII), Heidelberg, 1904.

HARRIS, MATTIE A.: *A Glossary of the West-Saxon Gospels, Latin-West Saxon and West Saxon-Latin* (= *Yale Studies in English*, No. VI), Boston, 1899.

HAUPT, K.: *Infinitivsätze im Französischen, Ein Beitrag zur Französischen Syntax und Stilistik* (= *Marburger Beiträge zur Romanischen Philologie*, Heft XVII), Marburg, 1915.

HAVERS, W.: *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1911.

HEIN, B.: *Die Sprache der Altenglischen Glosse zu Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter*, Würzburg Dis., 1903.

HEINCKE, J.: *Ueber den Gebrauch des Reinen und Präpositionalen Infinitivs bei Mathurin Regnier*, Hamburg Progr., 1902.

HELLWIG, H.: *Untersuchungen über die Namen des Nordhumbrischen Liber Vitae*, I, Berlin Dis., 1888.

HELTEN, W. VAN: "Gab es Einen Gotischen Nominativus Absolutus?" in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXV, 1909, pp. 310-311.

HELTEN,[1] W. L. VAN: "In *Dit* of *Dat Doende*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, II, 1882, pp. 174-177.

HELTEN,[2] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: VIII. Nog iets over de Absolute Naamvallen," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, V, 1885, pp. 207-220.

HELTEN,[3] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XIV. *Laet Wi, Laten Wi* ter Omschrijving van den Adhortatief," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, X, 1891, pp. 208-210.

HELTEN,[4] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXV. Over den Afhankelijken Infinitief zonder *Te*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, X, 1891, pp. 222-240.

HELTEN,[5] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXVII. Over het Gebruik van den Infinitief als Subject, Object of in Verbinding met *Dan*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XI, 1892, pp. 165-168.

HELTEN,[6] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXVIII. Over het Gebruik van een Infinitief in Plaats van 't Partic. Perf. ter Omschrijving van een Verleden Tijd," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XI, 1892, pp. 168-177.

HELTEN,[7] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXIX. Over de Woordschikking in Zinnen met Zitten enz. en een Verbum Finitum," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XI, 1892, pp. 177-178.

HELTEN,[8] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXX. Over 't Gebruik van het Partic. Praes. bij *Sijn*, *Werden*, enz.," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XI, 1892, pp. 178-180.

HELTEN,[9] W. L. VAN: "Bijdragen tot de Dietsche Grammatica: XXXI. Over de Praedicaatsdeelwoorden met het Karakter van een Infinitief," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XI, 1892, pp. 180-186.

HENRY, VICTOR: Review of Callaway's *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon, in Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature* for 1901, pp. 255-256.

HERMANNS, W.: *Lautlehre und Dialektische Untersuchung der Altenglischen Interlinearversion der Benediktinerregel*, Bonn, 1906.

HERZFELD, G.: *An Old English Martyrology* (= *Early English Text Society's Publications*, No. CXVI), London, 1900.

HEUSLER, A.: *Altisländisches Elementarbuch* (= revision of Kahle's work with the same title), Heidelberg, 1913.

HILMER, H.: *Zur Altnordhumbrischen Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Goslar Jahresbericht, 1880.

HINSDALE, ELLEN C.: *Ueber die Wiedergabe des Lateinischen Futurums bei den Althochdeutschen Uebersetzern des 8.-10. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen Dis., 1897.

HIRST, T. O.: *A Grammar of the Dialect of Kendal (Westmoreland)* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XVI), Heidelberg, 1906.

HITTLE, E.: *Zur Geschichte der Altenglischen Präpositionen "Mid" und "Wiþ"* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft II), Heidelberg, 1901.

HOFFMANN, P.: *Die Mischprosa Notkers des Deutschen* (= *Palaestra*, No. LVIII), Berlin, 1910.

HOLTHAUSEN,[1] F.: "Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik Alt- und Mittelenglischer Denkmäler," in *Englische Studien*, XIV, 1890, pp. 393-401; XV, 1891, pp. 306-309; and XVI, 1892, pp. 429-433.

HOLTHAUSEN,[2] F.: "Zu Alt- und Mittelenglischen Dichtungen," in *Anglia*, XIV, 1892, pp. 302-322; XV, 1893, pp. 187-203; and XXII, 1899, pp. 141-144.

HOLTHAUSEN,[3] F.: "Zu Morris' *Old English Miscellany*," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXXXVIII, 1892, pp. 365-374.

HOLTHAUSEN,[4] F.: "Zur Mittelenglischen *Genesis and Exodus*," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CVII, 1901, pp. 386-392; CIX, 1902, pp. 126-127.

HOLTHAUSEN,[5] F.: "Zur Textkritik Mittelenglischer Dichtungen," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, XC, 1893, pp. 143-148, 295-296.

HORN, W.: *Historische Neuenglishe Grammatik*, I, Strassburg, 1908.

HÜTTMANN, E. T.: *Das Partizipium Praesentis bei Lydgate im Vergleich mit Chaucer's Gebrauch*, Kiel Dis., 1914.

HUPE, H.: *Cursor Studies, and Criticism on the Dialects of Its Manuscripts* (= *Early English Text Society's Publications*, CI), London, 1893.

IMME, T.: "Infinitiv mit *Um Zu*," in *Zeitschrift für den Deutschen Unterricht*, XXV, 1911, pp. 325-331.

JELLINEK, M. H.: *Geschichte der Neuhochdeutschen Grammatik von den Anfängen bis auf Adelung*, 2 vols., Heidelberg, 1913, 1914.

JESPERSEN,[1] O.: *Progress in Language with Special Reference to English*, London and New York, 1894.

JESPERSEN,[2] O.: *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1912.

JESPERSEN,[3] O.: *A Modern English Grammar, II. Syntax*, First Volume, Heidelberg, 1914.

JOHNSTON, O. M.: "The Italian Historical Infinitive," in *Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott*, Vol. II, pp. 327-334, Baltimore, no date.

KALEPKY, T.: "Zum Sogenannten Historischen Infinitiv im Französischen," in *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, XVII, 1893, pp. 285-288.

KALUZA, M.: "Kleinere Publikationen aus M. E. Handschriften," in *Englische Studien*, XIV, 1890, pp. 165-188. [On p. 179 there is a note concerning the retention or the non-retention of *to* before the Infinitive.]

KAPTEIJN, J. M. N.: "Die Uebersetzungstechnik der Gotischen Bibel in den Paulinischen Briefen," in *Indogermanische Forschungen*, XXIX, 1911, pp. 260-367.

KASTNER, L. E.: "L'Infinitif Historique au XVe Siècle," in *Revue de Philologie Française*, XVIII, 1904, pp. 161-167.

KAUFMANN, P.: *Ueber Genera Verbi im Althochdeutschen, besonders bei Isidor und Tatian*, Leipzig Dis., Erlangen, 1912.

KEHREIN, J.: *Grammatik der Deutschen Sprache des Fünfzehnten bis Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1863.

KEILMANN, J.: *Dativ und Accusativ beim Verbum*, Giessen Dis., Mainz, 1909.

KELLER, W.: *Die Literarischen Bestrebungen von Worcester in Angelsächsischer Zeit* (= *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker*, LXXXIV), Strassburg, 1900.

KELLUM, MARGARET D.: *The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St. Luke* (= *Yale Studies in English, No. XXX*), New York, 1906.

KENNEDY, A. G.: *The Pronoun of Address in English Literature of the Thirteenth Century*, Leland Stanford Dis., 1915.

KERN,[1] J. H.: Review of P. P. Glogger's *Das Leidener Glossar*, in *Englische Studien*, XXXVI, 1906, pp. 111-115.

KERN,[2] J. H.: *De met het Participium Praeteriti Omschreven Werkwoordsvormen in 't Nederlands*, Amsterdam, 1912.

KJEDERQVIST, J.: "The Dialect of Pewsey (Wiltshire)," in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London), 1903, pp. 1-144.

KLEIN, W.: *Der Dialekt von Stokesley in Yorkshire* (= *Palaestra*, No. CXXIV), Berlin, 1914.

KLUGE,[1] F.: "Angelsächsische Glossen (Addit. MS. 32, 246, British Museum)," in *Anglia*, VIII, 1885, pp. 448-452.

KLUGE,[2] F.: *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch*, 3rd ed., Halle, 1902.

KÖLBING,[1] E.: "On God Oreisun of Ure Lefdi, v. 37 ff.," in *Englische Studien*, I, 1877, pp. 169-170.

KÖLBING,[2] E.: "Kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik Englischer Dichter," in *Englische Studien*, III, 1880, pp. 273-334.

KÖLBING,[3] E.: "Kleine Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik Mittelenglischer Dichtungen," in *Englische Studien*, XVII, 1892, pp. 292-299.

KÖRTING, G.: "Der Historische Infinitiv," in *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XVIII, 1896, pp. 258-263.

KOLBE, T.: *Die Konjugation der Lindisfarner Evangelien* (= *Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft V), Bonn, 1912.

KONRATH, M.: "Zur Laut- und Flexionslehre des Mittelkentischen," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXXXVIII, 1892, pp. 47-66, 157-180; and LXXXIX, 1892, pp. 153-166.

KRACKOW, O.: *Die Nominalcomposita als Kunstmittel im Altenglischen Epos*, Berlin Dis., 1903.

KREICKEMEIER, H.: *Die Wortstellung im Nebensatz des Englischen*, Giessen Dis., Darmstadt, 1915.

KRETSCHMER, P.: "Zur Erklärung des Sogenannten Infinitivus Historicus," in *Glotta*, II, 1910, pp. 270-287.

KROHMER, W.: *Altenglisch "In" und "On,"* Berlin Dis., 1904.

KRÜGER,[1] G.: "Die Auslassung oder Ellipse," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CVII, 1901, pp. 350-374; and CVIII, 1902, pp. 107-130.

KRÜGER,[2] G.: "The English Participle Present and Gerund," in *Notes and Queries*, Eleventh Series, Vol. VI, 1912, p. 65.

KRÜGER,[3] G.: *Syntax der Englischen Sprache, zweite, neu bearbeitete und stark vermehrte Auflage, 4. Abteilung: Zeitwort*, Dresden und Leipzig, 1914.

LEA, ELIZABETH M.: "The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St. Mark, Part I. Phonology," in *Anglia*, XVI, 1893, pp. 62-134; "Part II. Inflection," *ibidem*, pp. 135-206.

LEHMANN, A.: *Luthers Sprache in Seiner Uebersetzung des Neuen Testaments*, Halle, 1873.

LENK, R.: "Die Syntax der Skeireins," in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zür Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXVI, 1910, pp. 237-306.

LERCH, E.: *Prädikative Participia für Verbalsubstantiva im Französischen* (= *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Heft XLII), Halle, 1912.

LEYDECKER, C.: *Ueber Beziehungen zwischen Althochdeutsche und Angelsächsische Glossen*, Bonn, 1911.

LICHTSINN, P.: *Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Infinitivs im Layamon's Brut*, Kiel Dis., 1913.

LINDELÖF,[1] U.: *Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham*, Helsingfors Dis., 1890.

LINDELÖF,[2] U.: "Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Altnorthumbrischen," in *Mémoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors*, I, 1893, pp. 219-302.

LINDELÖF,[3] U.: *Glossar zur Altnorthumbrischen Evangelienübersetzung in der Rushworth Handschrift (die Sogenannte Glosse Rushworth²)* (= *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, Tom. XXII, No. 5), Helsingfors, 1897.

LINDELÖF,[4] U.: "Die Handschrift Junius 27 der Bibliotheca Bodleiana," in *Mémoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors*, III, 1901, pp. 1-73.

LINDELÖF,[5] U.: *Wörterbuch zur Interlinearglosse des Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis* (= *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft IX, pp. 105-220), Bonn, 1901.

LINDELÖF,[6] U.: *Die Südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts, Die Sprache der Sogenannten Glosse Rushworth²* (= *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft X), Bonn, 1901.

LINDELÖF,[7] U.: *Studien zu Altenglischen Psalterglossen* (= *Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft XIII), Bonn, 1904.

LINDELÖF,[8] U.: "Die Altenglischen Glossen in Bosworth-Psalter (Brit. Mus. MS. Addit. 37517)," in *Mémoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors*, V, 1909, pp. 137-230.

LINDELÖF,[9] U.: "Ueber die Verbreitung des Sogennannten *U-* (*O-*) Umlauts in der Starken Verbalflexion des Altenglischen." in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXXXIX, 1892, pp. 129-152.

LINDEMANN *: *An Illustration of the Use of the English Periphrastic Conjugation Which Is formed by Means of the Auxiliary Verb "to Be" Joined to the Participle Present*, Lemgo Progr., 1869.

LINDSAY, W. M.: *An Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation Based on the Text of Plautus*, London and New York, 1896.

LLOYD, R. J.: *Northern English*, 2d ed., Leipzig, 1908.

LOGEMAN,[1] H.: "Some Cases of Scandinavian Influence on English," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXVII, 1906-1907, pp. 29-46, and pp. 268-286.

LOGEMAN,[2] H.: "Det Saakaldte Passive Nutidsparticip i Norsk og Beslægtede Sprog," in *Arkiv för Nordisk Philologi*, XXX, 1913-1914, pp. 17-42.

LÜCKE, O.: *Absolute Participia im Gotischen und Ihr Verhältnis zum Griechischen Original*, Göttingen Dis., Magdeburg, 1876.

LUICK, K.: *Studien zur Englischen Lautgeschichte* (= *Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie*, No. XVII), Wien, 1903.

LUKER, B. F.: *The Use of the Infinitive instead of a Finite Verb* (= *Columbia University Studies in Romance Philology* and *Literature*), New York, 1916.

LUND, G. F. V.: *Oldnordisk Ordföjningslære*, København, 1862.

LUTHER, J.: Review of Carl Franke's *Grundzüge der Schriftsprache Luthers, Versuch einer Historischen Grammatik der Schriftsprache Luthers*, Görliz, 1888, in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*, XXIV, 1892, pp. 67-81.

MAACK, R.: *Die Flexion des Englischen Substantivs von 1100 bis etwa 1250*, Strassburg Dis., Hamburg, 1888.

MÄTZNER, E., and BIELING, H.: *Altenglische Sprachproben nebst einem Wörterbuche*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1867-1900.

MAIER, G.: "Das *Ge*-Partizip im Neuhochdeutschen," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung*, I, 1901, pp. 281-318.

MANSION, J.: *Althochdeutsches Lesebuch für Anfänger*, Heidelberg, 1912.

MANTHEY, W.: *Syntaktische Beobachtungen an Notkers Uebersetzung des Martianus Capella*, Berlin Dis., 1903.

MARCH, F. A.: *A Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Language*, New York, 1873.

* No initial is given in the article.

MARINOFF, VALERIE: *Die Periphrastische Form des Englischen Verbums in Ihrer Verwendung als Intensivum im Modernen Sprachgebrauch*, Halle Dis., 1915.

MAROUZEAU, J.: "L'Emploi du Participe Présent Latin à l'Époque Républicaine," in *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, Tome Seizième, Paris, 1910-1911, pp. 133-216.

MATTHIAS,[1] T.: "Zur Geschichte der Deutschen Mittelwortfügungen," in *Zeitschrift für den Deutschen Unterricht*, XI, 1897, pp. 681-708.

MATTHIAS,[2] T.: "Die Nennform mit *Um Zu*," in *Zeitschrift des Allgemeinen Deutschen Sprachvereins*, IX, 1894, columns 137-142.

MEER,[1] M. J. VAN DER: *Gotische Casussyntaxis*, Leiden, 1901.

MEER,[2] M. J. VAN DER: "Gotica: 1. Der Gotische Acc. C. Inf. in Subjectsätzen und nach *Swaei* und *Swe*," in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXIX, 1913, pp. 201-209.

MENSING,[1] O.: *Untersuchungen ueber die Syntax der Concessivsätze in Alt- und Mittelhochdeutschen mit Besonderer Rücksicht auf Wolframs Parzival*, Kiel Dis., 1891.

MENSING,[2] O.: See Erdmann, O.

MEYER, K.: *Zur Syntax des Participium Praesentis im Althochdeutschen*, Marburg Dis., 1906.

MEYER,[1] R. M.: "Hilfsverba Zweiter Ordnung," in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, XXXIV, 1909, pp. 267-291.

MEYER,[2] R. M.: "Die Konstruktion mit Unberechtigtem Doppelinfinitiv," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung*, XII, 1910, pp. 264-266.

MEYER, W.: *Flexionslehre der Ältesten Schottischen Urkunden* (1385-1440) (=Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XXIX), Halle, 1907.

MEYN, L.: "Das Gerundivum im Englischen," in *Germanisch-Romanische Monatschrift*, III, 1911, pp. 671-672.

MICHELS, V.: *Mittelhochdeutsches Elementarbuch*, 2d ed., Heidelberg, 1912.

MICHIELS, H.: *Ueber Englische Bestandteile Altdeutscher Glossenhandschriften*, Bonn, 1912.

MIGNE, J. P.: "Vita Sanctæ Mariæ Ægypticæ, Meretricis," in his *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Series Latina, Vol. LXXIII, columns 671-690, Paris, 1879.

MIKKELSEN, KR.: *Dansk Ordföjningslære med Sproghistoriske Tillæg*, København, 1911.

MÖNCH, E.: *Die Verwendung des Gerundiums und des Participiums Praesentis im Französischen*, Göttingen Dis., 1912.

MORSBACH, L.: *Mittelenglische Grammatik*, I, Halle, 1896.

MOUREK, V. E.: *Weitere Beiträge zur Syntax des Althochdeutschen Tatian*, Prag, 1894.

MÜHLAU, J.: *Zur Frage nach der Gotischen Psalmenuebersetzung*, Kiel Dis., 1904. [Since writing the footnote on p. 21 of my *Studies*, I have acquired a copy of Mühlau's dissertation.]

MÜLLER, R.: *Untersuchungen ueber die Namen des Nordhumbrischen Liber Vitae* (= *Palaestra*, No. IX), Berlin, 1901.

MULLER, J. W.: "De Taalvormen van Reinaert I en II: Verbogen Infin. na *te*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, VII, 1887, pp. 54-57.

MURRAY, J. A. H.: "The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland," in *Transactions of the Philological Society* [*London*] for 1870-1872, pp. 1-251.

MUTSCHMANN, H.: *A Phonology of the Northeastern Scotch Dialect on an Historical Basis* (= *Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft I), Bonn, 1909.

NABER, E.: *Otfrids Sprache und die Althochdeutschen Bibelglossare*, Bonn Dis., 1912.

NAGEL, F. H. F.: *Der Dativ in der Frühmittelenglischen Prosa mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung von Synthese und Analyse*, Greifswald Dis., 1909.

NAPIER,[1] A. S.: "Ein Altenglisches Leben des Heiligen Chad," in *Anglia*, X, 1888, pp. 131-154 (with an *Anhang*, pp. 154-156).

NAPIER,[2] A. S.: "The Old Northumbrian Glosses in MS. Palatine 68," in *The Academy* (London), XXXVI, 1889, No. 903, p. 119.

NAPIER,[3] A. S.: "Altenglische Glossen," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXXXV, 1890, pp. 309-316.

NAPIER,[4] A. S.: "Bruchstücke Einer Altenglischen Evangelienhandschrift," in Herrig's *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, LXXXVII, 1891, pp. 255-261.

NAPIER,[5] A. S.: *Old English Glosses*, Oxford, 1900.

NAPIER, A. S., and STEVENSON, W. A.: *The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents Now in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford, 1895.

NAUMANN,[1] H.: *Notkers Boethius: Untersuchungen ueber Quellen und Stil* (= *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker*, Vol. CXXI), Strassburg, 1913.

NAUMANN,[2] H.: *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, Berlin, 1914.

NAUMANN,[3] H.: *Kurze Historische Syntax der Deutschen Sprache*, Strassburg, 1915.

NOREEN,[1] A.: *Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen*, 3d ed., Halle, 1903.

NOREEN,[2] A.: *Altschwedische Grammatik*, Halle, 1904.

NOREEN,[3] A.: *Geschichte der Nordischen Sprachen Besonders in Altnordischer Zeit* (reprint from Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*), 3d ed., Strassburg, 1913.

NYGAARD,[1] M.: "Om Brugen af det Saakaldte Praesens Particip i Oldnorsk," in *Aarbøger for Nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* for 1879, pp. 203-228.

NYGAARD,[2] M.: "Den Lærde Stil i den Norrøne Prosa," in *Sprogligt-Historiske Studien Tilegnede Prof. C. R. Unger*, pp. 153-170, Kristiania, 1896.

NYGAARD,[3] M.: *Norrøn Syntax*, Kristiania, 1906.

OESS, G.: *Der Altenglische Arundel-Psalter, Eine Interlinearversion in der Handschrift Arundel 60 des Britischen Museums* (= *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft XXX), Heidelberg, 1910.

ONIONS,[1] C. T.: A Review of C. A. Smith's *Studies in English Syntax*, in *Englische Studien*, XXXVII, 1909, pp. 217-220.

ONIONS,[2] C. T.: "The History of the English Gerund," in *Englische Studien*, XLVIII, 1914-1915, pp. 169-171.

OTTEN, G.: *The Language of the Rushworth Gloss to the Gospel of St. Matthew*, Parts I and II, Leipzig, 1890, 1891.

PALM, B.: *The Place of the Adjective Attribute in English Prose from the Oldest Times up to Our Days: A Syntactic-Historical Study*, Lund Dis., 1911.

PANNING, E.: *Dialektisches Englisch in Elizabethanischen Dramen*, Halle-Wittenberg Dis., Halle a. S., 1884.

PAUL,[1] H.: *Die Umschreibung des Perfektums im Deutschen mit Haben und Sein* (*Abhandlungen der Kaiserlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, I. cl., XXII Bd., I. Abth.), München, 1902.

PAUL,[2] H.: *Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik*, 9th ed., Halle, 1913.

PEACOCK, R. B.: "On Some Leading Characteristics of Northumbrian; and on the Variations in Its Grammar from That of Standard English, with Their Probable Etymological Sources," in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London) for 1862-1863, pp. 232-263.

PERLITZ, P.: *Die Sprache der Interlinearversion von Defensor's Liber Scintillarum*, Kiel Dis., 1904.

PFEIFFER, F.: *Umschreibung des Verbums im Französischen durch "Aller," "Venir," + Gerundium," "Etre" + Participium Praesentis, und durch Reflexive Konstruktion*, Göttingen Dis., 1909.

PHILIPPSEN, M.: *Die Deklination in den "Vices and Virtues,"* Kiel Dis., Erlangen, 1911.

PLUMHOFF, A. L.: *Beiträge zu den Quellen Otfrids*, Kiel Dis., 1898.

PRATJE,[1] H.: *Der Accusativ im Heliand Syntaktisch Dargestellt*, Sobenheim, 1882.

PRATJE,[2] H.: "Syntax des Heliand, I. Das Verbum," in *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Niederdeutsche Sprachforschung* for 1885, XI, 1886, pp. 1-84.

PREUSLER, W.: *Syntax im Poema Morale*, Breslau Dis., 1914.

PÜTTMANN, A.: "Die Syntax der Sogennannten Progressiven Form im Alt- und Frühmittelenglischen," in *Anglia*, XXXI, 1908, pp. 405-452; also as a Marburg Dis., 1908.

RAINE, J.: *A Volume of English Miscellanies Illustrating the History and Language of the Northern Counties of England* (= *Surtees Society's Publications*, No. LXXXV), Durham and Edinburgh, 1890.

RAMAIN, G.: "L'Emploi de l'Infinitif Historique," in *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature, et d'Histoire Anciennes*, XXXVIII, 1914, pp. 5-26.

REEVES, W. P.: *A Study in the Language of Scottish Prose before 1600*, Johns Hopkins Dis., 1893.

REIMANN, M.: *Die Sprache der Mittelkentischen Evangelien* (*Codd. Royal I. A. und Hatton 38*), Berlin Dis., 1883.

REINKENS, J. M.: *Ueber den Accusativus cum Infinitivo bei Plautus und Terentius*, Düsseldorf Progr., 1887.

RHYNE, O. P.: "Conjunction Plus Participle Group in English," in *Studies in Philology*, IV, 1910, pp. 5-29.

RICHTER, C.: *Chronologische Studien zur Angelsächsischen Literatur auf Grund Sprachlich-metrischen Kriterien* (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XXXIII), Halle, 1909.

RICK, K.: *Das Prädikative Participium Praesentis im Althochdeutschen*, Bonn Dis., 1905.

RITTER, O.: "Zur Mundart des Nordöstlichen Schottland," in *Englische Studien*, XLVI, 1912, pp. 9-65.

RODEFFER, J. D.: *The Inflection of the Present Plural Indicative with Especial Reference to the Northern Dialect*, Johns Hopkins Dis., 1903.

ROEDER, F.: *Der Altenglische Regius-Psalter, Eine Interlinearversion in HS. Royal 2. B. 5. des Brit. Mus.* (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XVIII), Halle, 1904.

RÖSEMEIER, E.: *Ueber Sprache und Mundart Einiger Kleinerer Altenglischer Denkmäler aus Sweet's "Oldest English Texts,"* Münster Dis., Bonn, 1913.

ROSS, C. H.: *The Absolute Participle in Middle and Modern English*, Johns Hopkins Dis., Baltimore, 1893. [Appeared, also, in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, VIII, 1893, pp. 245-302.]

ROST, J.: *Die Syntax des Dativus im Althochdeutschen und in den Geistlichen Dichtungen der Uebergangsperiode zum Mittelhochdeutschen, I. Teil: Der Eigentliche Dativus bei Verben*, Halle Dis., 1878.

ROTH, W.: *Die Wortstellung im Aussagehauptsatz Angelsächsischer Originalprosa* (*Annalen* 800-900, 1066-1154), Kapitel A-E, Berlin Dis., 1914.

ROYSTER,[1] J. F.: "The *Do* Auxiliary—1400 to 1450," in *Modern Philology*, XII, 1915-1916, pp. 449-456.

ROYSTER,[2] J. F.: "A Note on Lydgate's Use of the *Do* Auxiliary," in *Studies in Philology*, XIII, 1916, pp. 69-71.

RÜBENS, G.: *Parataxe und Hypotaxe in dem Ältesten Teil der Sachsenchronik* (*Parker HS bis zum Jahre* 891) (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft LVI), Halle, 1915.

SANDERS, H.: *Der Syntaktische Gebrauch des Infinitivs im Frühmittelenglischen* (= *Kieler Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Neue Folge, Heft 7), Heidelberg, 1915.

SANDERS, W. B.: *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, three parts, Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton, 1878-1884.

SCHAEDEL, K.: *Das Altenglische Element in den Neuenglischen Dialekten*, Münster Dis., Frankfurt a. M., 1911.

SCHAEFER, C.: *Der Substantivierte Infinitiv im Französischen*, Kiel Dis., 1910.

SCHIESSL, J.: *Laut- und Flexionsverhältnisse der Frühmittelenglischen Rezeptensammlung Peri Didaxeon*, München Dis., Erlangen, 1905.

SCHILLING, K. G.: *A Grammar of the Dialect of Oldham* (*Lancashire*), Giessen Dis., Darmstadt, 1906.

SCHIPPER, J.: *Alfreds Uebersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte* (= Grein-Wülker's *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*, Vol. IV), Leipzig, 1897-1899.

SCHLEMILCH, W.: *Beiträge zur Sprache und Orthographie Spätaltenglischer Sprachdenkmäler der Uebergangszeit* (1100-1150) (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XXXIV), Halle, 1914.

SCHMITT, H.: "Prinzipielles zur Verbalen Ausdrucks-weise und zum Englischen 'Akkusativ mit dem Infinitiv,'" in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, XXI, 1913, pp. 366-372.

SCHNEIDER, J. P.: *The Prose Style of Richard Rolle of Hampole with Special Reference to Its Euphuistic Tendencies*, Johns Hopkins Dis., Baltimore, 1906.

SCHULTE,[1] E.: *Untersuchung der Beziehung der Altenglischen Matthäusglosse im Rushworth-Manuskript zu dem Lateinischen Text der Handschrift*, Bonn Dis., 1903.

SCHULTE,[2] E.: *Glossar zu Farmans Anteil an der Rushworth-Glosse* (*Rushworth 1*), Bonn, 1904.

SCHULZE, A.: "Zur Lehre vom Französischen Infinitiv," in *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, XV, 1891, pp. 504-510.

SCHULZE, O.: "Ueber die Stellung Gewisser Satzteile zwischen Hilfsverb und Verb und Ähnliche Erscheinungen im Englischen," in *Die Neueren Sprachen*, XX, 1912, pp. 119-125, 190.

SCHWERDTFEGER, E.: *A Dissertation on the History and Development of the English Verb*, New York, 1874.

SIEVERS,[1] E.: "Zu den Angelsächsischen Glossen," in *Anglia*, XIII, 1891, pp. 309-322.

SIEVERS,[2] E.: *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, 3d ed., Halle, 1898.

SIEVERS,[3] E.: *Zum Angelsächsischen Vocalismus*, Univ. Progr., Leipzig, 1900.

SIEVERS,[4] E.: *Rhythmisch-Melodische Studien* (= *Germanische Bibliothek*, herausgegeben von Wilhelm Streitberg, II, (5)), Heidelberg, 1912.

SIXTUS, J.: *Der Sprachgebrauch des Dialektschriftstellers Frank Robinson zu Bowness in Westmoreland* (= *Palaestra*, No. 116), Berlin, 1912.

SKEAT,[1] W. W.: *Ælfric's Lives of Saints* (= *Early English Text Society's Publications*, Nos. LXXVI, LXXXII, XCIV, CXIV), London, 1881, 1885, 1890, 1900.

SKEAT,[2] W. W.: "Nine Specimens of English Dialects," in *English Dialect Society's Publications*, XXXII, 1896, pp. 1-193.

SKEAT,[3] W. W.: *English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day*, Cambridge, England, 1912.

SKEAT, W. W., and NODAL, J. H., Editors: *A Bibliographical List of the Works That Have Been Published, or Are Known to Exist in MS., Illustrative of the Various Dialects of English*, Compiled by Members of the English Dialect Society, London, 1877.

SMITH, C. A.: "Ordinary North-Carolinese, or 'I Had Rather Stay Than to Go with You,'" in *Studies in Philology*, XIII, 1916, pp. 95-99.

SMITH, G. G.: *Specimens of Middle Scots*, Edinburgh and London, 1902.

SORG, W.: *Zur Syntax und Stilistik des Pronominalgebrauches in der Älteren Angelsächsischen Dichtung*, Breslau Dis., 1912.

SPIES, H.: *Studien zur Geschichte des Englischen Pronomens im XV und XVI Jahrhundert* (*Flexionslehre und Syntax*) (Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft 1), Halle, 1897.

STAHL, J. M.: *Kritischhistorische Syntax des Griechischen Verbums* (= *Sammlung Indogermanischer Lehrbücher*, herausgegeben von Hirt und Streitberg, I, i, 4), Heidelberg, 1907.

STEINMEYER, E.: "Lateinische und Altenglische Glossen," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum*, XXXIII, 1889, pp. 242-251.

STEVENSON, J.: *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis* (= *The Publications of the Surtees Society*, No. X), London and Edinburgh, 1840.

STEVENSON, J., and WARING, G.: *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels* (= *The Publications of the Surtees Society*, Vols. XXVIII, XXXIX, XLIII, and XLVIII), Durham, London, and Edinburgh, 1854-1865. [Stevenson edited *Matthew;* Waring, the other Gospels.]

STIMMING, A.: "Verwendung des Gerundiums und des Participiums Praesentis im Altfranzösischen," in *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, X, 1886, pp. 526-552.

STIMMING, E.: *Der Accusativus cum Infinitivo im Französischen* (= *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, Heft LIX), Halle, 1915.

STODTE, H.: *Ueber die Sprache und Heimat der Katherine-Gruppe, Ein Beitrag zur Mittelenglischen Dialektkunde*, Göttingen Dis., 1896.

STOETT, F. A.: *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst: Syntaxis*, 's-Gravenhage, 1889. [I have not been able to consult the second edition of Stoett (1909). The reference thereto on p. 35 of my *Studies* is from Einenkel's *Geschichte der Englischen Sprache*, 3rd ed., p. 60.]

STOLZ, W.: *Der Vokalismus der Betonten Silben in der Altnordhumbrischen Interlinearversion der Lindisfarner Evangelien*, Bonn, 1908.

STOLZENBURG, H.: "Zur Uebersetzungstechnik des Wulfila," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Philologie*, XXXVII, 1905, pp. 145-193, 352-392.

STREITBERG, W.: *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, Dritte und Vierte Verbesserte Aufl., Heidelberg, 1910.

STURTEVANT, A. M.: "Zum Gotischen Dativ nach *Wairþan* mit Infinitiv," in *Modern Language Notes*, XXXII, 1917, pp. 141-151.

SVENSSON, J. V.: *Om Språket in der Förra* (*Merciska*) *Delen af Rushworth-Handskriften*, I. *Ljudlara*, Uppsala Dis., Göteberg, 1883.

SWANE, W.: *Studien zur Casussyntax des Frühmittelenglischen*, Kiel Dis., Flensburg, 1904.

SWEET, H.: "Dialects and Prehistoric Forms of Old English," in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (London), 1875-1876, pp. 543-569, and reprinted in *Collected Papers of Henry Sweet*, arranged by H. C. Wyld, Oxford, 1913, pp. 185-211. [My quotation is from the *Collected Papers*.]

TAXWEILER, R.: *Angelsächsische Urkundenbücher von Kentischem Lokalcharakter*, Berlin Dis., 1906.

THIELMANN, P.: "*Facere* mit dem Infinitiv," in *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, III, 1886, pp. 177-206.

TORP, A.: see Falk.

TRAEGER, F.: *Studien zur Sprache von Notkers Boetius*, in Landshut Progr., 1906.

TRILSBACH, G.: *Die Lautlehre der Spätwestsächsischen Evangelien*, Bonn, 1905.

UHRSTRÖM, W.: *Studies on the Language of Samuel Richardson*, Uppsala Dis., 1907.

VENDRYES, J.: "Sur l'Emploi de l'Infinitif au Génitif dans Quelques Langues Indo-Européennes," in *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, XVI, 1910, pp. 247-260.

VERDAM,[1] J.: "Absolute Naamvallen in 't MNL. en Ndl.," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal-en Letterkunde*, II, 1882, pp. 188-198.

VERDAM,[2] J.: "Infinitief in Plaats van Participium," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, XXXII, 1912, p. 72.

VERWIJS, E.: "Sprokkelingen [uit de Nalatenschap van —, Uitgegeven door J. Verdam]: I. *Lesende Vinden*," in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, II, 1882, pp. 178-180.

VOGES, F.: "Der Reflexive Dativ im Englischen," in *Anglia* VI, 1883, pp. 317-374.

WALL, A.: "A Contribution towards the Study of the Scandinavian Element in English Dialects," in *Anglia*, XX, 1898, pp. 45-135.

WEGENER, Dr.: *Vom Gebrauch des Accusativ im Englischen*, Königsberg, 1852.

WEGENER, W.: *Die Englische Verbalform auf "-Ing,"* Königsberg, 1872.

WEHLITZ, H.: *Die Congruenz des Participii Praeteriti in Activer Verbalconstruction im Französischen (vom Anfang des XIII bis zum Ende des XV Jahrhunderts)*, Greifswald Dis., 1887.

WEIGHTMAN, JANE: *The Language and Dialect of the Later Old English Poetry*, Liverpool, 1907.

WELLER, A.: *Die Frühmittelhochdeutsche Wiener Genesis nach Quellen, Uebersetzungsart, Stil, und Syntax* (= *Palaestra*, No. CXXIII), Berlin, 1914.

WELLS,[1] J. E.: "Accidence in *The Owl and the Nightingale*," in *Anglia*, XXXIII, 1910, pp. 252-269.

WELLS,[2] J. E.: *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, New Haven, 1916.

WENDE, E.: *Ueberlieferung und Sprache der Mittelenglischen Version des Psalters und Ihr Verhältnis zur Lateinischen Vorlage*, Breslau Dis., 1884.

WENDE, F.: *Ueber die Nachgestellten Präpositionen im Angelsächsischen* (= *Palaestra*, No. LXX), Berlin, 1915.

WENDT, G.: *Syntax des Heutigen Englisch, I. Die Wortlehre*, Heidelberg, 1911; *II. Die Satzlehre*, 1914.

WETZLAR, A.: *Die Sprache (Laut- und Formenlehre) der Nordenglischen Homiliensammlung des Edinburger Royal College of Physicians*, Freiburg Dis., 1907.

WEYHE, H.: *Zu den Altenglischen Verbalabstrakten auf -Nes und -Ing, -Ung*, Leipzig, 1910.

WILDHAGEN,[1] K.: *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: Die Sprache der Altenglischen Glosse, Ein Frühchristliches Psalterium die Grundlage* (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XIII), Halle, 1905.

WILDHAGEN,[2] K.: *Der Cambridger Psalter, Zum Ersten Male Herausgegeben, mit Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Lateinischen Textes, I. Text mit Erklärungen* (= Grein-Wülker's *Bibliothek der Angelsächischen Prosa*, Band VII), Hamburg, 1910.

WILDHAGEN,[3] K.: "Studien zum Psalterium Romanum in England und zu Seinen Glossierungen (in Geschichtlicher Entwicklung)," in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach*, pp. 417-472 (=Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft L), Halle, 1913.

WILLERT, H.: "Vom Substantivischen Infinitiv," in *Englische Studien*, XLVIII, 1914-1915, pp. 246-250.

WILLIAMS,[1] IRENE F.: *A Grammatical Investigation of the Old Kentish Glosses* (=*Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, Heft XIX, pp. 92-166), Bonn, 1905.

WILLIAMS,[2] IRENE F.: "The Language of *Sawles Warde*," in *Anglia*, XXIX, 1906, pp. 413-416.

WILMANNS, W.: *Deutsche Grammatik, II. Wortbildung*, Strassburg, 1896; *III. Flexion, 1. Verbum*, 1906; *2. Nomen und Pronomen*, 1909.

WILSON, SIR JAMES: *Lowland Scotch as Spoken in the Lower Strathearn District of Perthshire*, London, 1915.

WINKEL, JAN TE: "Geschichte der Niederländischen Sprache," in Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 2nd ed., I, pp. 781-925, Strassburg, 1898.

WINKLER, H.: *Germanische Casussyntax*, I, Berlin, 1896.

WINKLER, JOHANNNA: *Die Periphrastische Verbindung der Verba "Sin" und "Werden" mit dem Participium Präsentis im Mittelhochdeutschen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Heidelberg Dis., Leipzig, 1913.

WITTE *: "Ueber das Neuangelsächsische Pronomen," in *Englische Studien*, II, 1879, pp. 121-141.

WOLFF, R.: *Untersuchung der Laute in den Kentischen Urkunden*, Heidelberg Dis., 1893.

WORDSWORTH, J., and WHITE, H. I.: *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronimi*, Oxonii, 1889-1893.

WRIGHT,[1] J.: "A Grammar of the Dialect of Windhill in the West Riding of Yorkshire," in *Publications of the English Dialect Society*, No. LXVII, London, 1892.

WRIGHT,[2] J.: "Englische Mundarten," in Paul's *Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, 2d ed., I, 1901, pp. 1531-1537.

WRIGHT,[3] J.: *The English Dialect Grammar*, Oxford, 1905.

WRIGHT,[4] J.: *Grammar of the Gothic Language*, Oxford, 1910.

WRIGHT, JOSEPH and ELIZABETH MARY: *Old English Grammar*, London, 1908.

WULFF, F. A.: *L'Emploi de l'Infinitif dans les Plus Anciens Textes Français, avec un Historique Général de l'Infinitif* (=*Lunds Univ. Årsskrift*, Tom. XI), Lund, no date.

* No initial is given in Witte's essay.

WUNDERLICH, H.: *Der Deutsche Satzbau*, 2d ed., 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1901.

WUTH, A.: *Aktionsarten der Verba bei Cynewulf*, Leipzig Dis., Weida, 1915.

WYLD, H. C.: see Sweet,[1] Henry.

ZEHME, A.: *Ueber Bedeutung und Gebrauch der Hülfsverba:* 1. *"Soln" und "Müezen" bei Wolfram von Eschenbach*, Halle-Wittenberg Dis., 1890.

ZEITLIN, J.: "The English Verbal as Adverb," in *Neophilologus*, II, 1917, pp. 123-127.

ZENKE, W.: *Synthesis und Analysis des Verbums im Ormulum* (= Morsbach's *Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, Heft XL), Halle, 1910.

ZEUNER,[1] R.: *Die Sprache des Kentischen Psalters* (*Vespasian A. I.*), Halle, 1881.

ZEUNER,[2] R.: *Wortschatz des Sogennannten Kentischen Psalters*, Erstes Stück, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht ueber das Fürstliche Gymnasium zu Gera, Gera, 1891.

ZUPITZA,[1] J.: *The Romance of Guy of Warwick* (= *Early English Text Society's Publications*, Nos. XXV and XXVI), London, 1875-1876. [In his note to line 1925, there is a comment on the retention of *to* before an Infinitive.]

ZUPITZA,[2] J.: "Kentische Glossen des Neunten Jahrhunderts," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, XXI, 1877, pp. 1-59.

ZUPITZA,[3] J.: "Mercisches aus der HS. Royal 2 A 20," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, XXXIII, 1889, pp. 47-66.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

All the Abbreviations used in this monograph are self-explanatory, I think, with the possible exception of these two: cfv. = co-ordinated finite verb and sfv. = subordinated finite verb. See pp. 31 ff.

Concerning the Voice of the Present Participle in Absolute, Appositive, and Predicative Uses, discussed respectively in Note 1, p. 5, in Note 1, p. 86, and in Note 4, pp. 184-186, see, besides the references there given, the following, which was inadvertently omitted: Bouterwek's *Die Vier Evangelien in Alt-Nordhumbrischer Sprache*, pp. civ-cv. Bouterwek cites a few examples of a Northumbrian present participle that is, he holds, passive in sense, in appositive, in predicative, and in substantival uses. His examples of the appositive use seem to me doubtful. He says nothing of the voice of the present participle in absolute uses. Of the passive use of the present participle in the other three idioms, he offers this explanation: "Sehr wahrscheinlich beruhen diese Ungewöhnlichkeiten mehr auf Verschlechterung der Mundart und sind Zeichen später Zeit, als dass sie einem tieferen Sprachgesetze folgen."

Of the seven examples of the Imperative Infinitive given by me on p. 175, two (*Mk.* 11. 23a,b) are incidentally cited in the "Prolegomena" to Stevenson and Waring's *The Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels*, p. civ, along with various other passages "where both glosses render the text with verbal identity in so erroneous or so singular a manner, that mere coincidence is out of the question, and the only possible hypothesis is that both glossists drew from a common original."

Owing to the interruption in the postal service caused by the International War, I have not been able to procure the following works before going to press:—Ekwall, Eilert: *Contributions to the History of the English Dialects* [Lunds Univ. Årsskr.], Gleerup, Lund, 1917; Nygaard, M.: *Bemerkninger, Rettelser, og Tillæg til Min Norrøn Syntax*, Dybwad, Kristiania, 1917. See, also, the footnote to p. 21.

The following corrections should be made:—

P. 27, l. 26: at the end of this line insert the second half of the brackets.

P. 139, l. 28: insert *L.* 13. 33^{b} before *soð*.

P. 175, l. 34: change *ges-tœna* to *ge-stœna*.

P. 184, Note 1: on second thought it seems better to consider that the passage here quoted gives us an example, not of the Elliptical Accusative-with-Infinitive Construction, but of the Predicative Accusative of a Preterite Participle that is active in sense. M. C., JR.

PE231 .C15
Studies in the syntax of the Lindisfarne
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00027 1892